NUMBER FIVE MAY, 1961

★ EDITORIAL NOTES 1

★ THE CHOICE BEFORE NEW AFRICA
by N. Numadé 10

★ FEDERATION AND THE IDEAS OF MR. NYERERE
by A. Zanzolo 23

★ SOLIDARITY WITH SOUTH AFRICA
by Toussaint 29

★ MARXIST EDUCATION SERIES: No. 2
by Jalang Kwena 42

★ A MARXIST BOOK ON AFRICA: BOOK REVIEW
by J. Girodot 49

★ TWO MESSAGES 59

Published in the interests of African solidarity and as a forum for Marxist-Leninist thought throughout our Continent, by the
SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNIST PARTY.

Subscribe to

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

(Published by the South African Communist Party)

Make sure of getting copies of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST (four issues a year) by filling in the form below and sending it together with a British postal order.

Name.....

Address .....

.....

.....

I enclose 6 shillings (or 15 shillings by airmail) for one year's subscription beginning from.....issue.

Please Post to the London Agent

Mr. Ellis Bowles

52, Palmerston Road, East Sheen, London, S.W.14

PATRICE LUMUMBA

In sorrow and in anger we lower our banner in the memory of a great patriot and martyr, who died in the cause of Africa's freedom, brutally murdered by traitors and hired gangsters of imperialism. Patrice Lumumba, Africa will never forget your name. You will be avenged.

Hamba kahle.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Khrushchov on Colonialism

At the fifteenth session of the United Nations' General Assembly last September, the Soviet delegation made a powerful plea for the final abolition of the iniquitous system of colonialism, and put forward a specific resolution to this effect. The resolution was advocated in a brilliant speech by the head of the delegation, Comrade N. S. Khrushchov. We make no apology for reproducing extracts from his speech at some length, for his words were not published in the capitalist newspapers. They are words that will be near and dear to every African; and it is right that our people should know how their problems are regarded by a great Communist of our times. Khrushchov said :

> *"The emancipation and revival of independent life among peoples which for centuries have been kept off the highway of mankind's development by the colonialists is taking place for all to see — this is the great sign of our epoch. In* 15 *years alone, about* 1,500 *million people—that is, half the population of the earth — have cast off the chains of colonial oppression. Dozens of new national States have been formed on the debris of old colonial empires.*
>
> *"A new period in the history of mankind was ushered in when the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America began*

taking an active part in settling the destinies of the whole world, jointly with the peoples of Europe and North America. Without acknowledging this irrefutable fact, there can be no realistic foreign policy, no foreign policy in step with the demands of the time or in conformity with the peace-loving aspirations of the peoples.

"Is it imaginable that, in our times, major international problems can be solved without the participation of the People's Republic of China? Is it possible to solve these problems without the participation of India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Ghana, Guinea and other States? Let anyone who holds a different opinion on this subject try here, within the walls of the United Nations, to disregard the opinion and voice of the representatives of the States of Asia, Africa and Latin America! It is true that the appearance of the new States of Asia and Africa in the United Nations has struck some Western countries with fear.

"Further, there was even some talk of restricting the additional influx of the newly emerging States to the United Nations.

"As for the Soviet Union, I will tell you frankly that we are satisfied at the appearance in the United Nations of a large number of new States. We have always opposed and will oppose any infringements on the rights of peoples who have attained national independence. What makes these States close to us is our common desire to preserve and strengthen peace, to create on our planet conditions for peaceful co-existence and co-operation among countries, regardless of their Government and social systems, in conformity with the peaceable principles proclaimed by the Bandung conference of the Afro-Asian countries. The facts show that the liberation of nations and peoples from colonial oppression puts international relations on a sounder basis, increases international co-operation and strengthens world peace.

People Can Rule Themselves.

"The peoples of the new States have proved convincingly that they are not only able to do without the control and guardianship of the colonial Powers, that they are not only able to administer themselves, but that they are also active builders of a new life, and incomparably more rational

administrators and frugal masters of their wealth, of the riches of their countries, than the colonial authorities.

"Early this year I had the opportunity of visiting India, Indonesia, Burma and Afghanistan. I must say that I was strongly impressed by their great progress in developing their national economy and culture. In these countries we saw big new projects, the construction of dams, roads, the building of new universities and institutes.

"Could you see such a picture in the colonies, too? No! — they do not and cannot have anything of the kind. They are completely under the iniquitous rule of foreigners. The peoples of the colonial countries are not only denied the right to independence and self-government, but their national and human feelings and dignity are insulted and trampled upon at every step. Ruthlessly exploiting and plundering the colonies, the foreign monopolies are draining them of all their assets, barbarously robbing them of their wealth.

"As a result of colonial rule, the economy of the colonies is extremely backward, and their working population drags out a miserable existence. It is in the colonies that we see the longest working hours, coupled with the lowest national income, the lowest wages, the highest rate of illiteracy, the lowest expectation of life and the highest death rate.

"There is no need to describe here in detail the disastrous, lawless position of more than a hundred million human beings who still languish in colonial slavery. The archives of the United Nations contain more than enough reports from various United Nations commissions, petitions and complaints describing the position of the population in those countries and territories where the colonial regime of administration persists under various names. These documents are an indictment of the disgraceful colonial regime. What is happening in these countries and areas rightly evokes the deep indignation of all honest people on earth. But the times when foreign oppressors could rule placidly have passed — even in those colonies which still exist today. While the old order remains in the colonies, people there are becoming new. They are growing increasingly aware of their situation and resolutely refusing to bear the colonial yoke. And when the peoples rise in struggle for freedom, for a better life, no power on earth can stem their mighty movement.

Africa is Seething.

"Look what is taking place in the colonies now! **Africa is seething and boiling like a volcano.** *For nearly six years the Algerian people have been waging a heroic and selfless struggle for their national liberation. The peoples of Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, Ruanda-Urundi, Angola, Mozambique, Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, Sierra Leone, South-West Africa, Zanzibar, and also West Irian, Puerto Rico and many other colonies, are rising with ever-growing determination to struggle for their rights.*

"It should be clear to all that nothing and no one can stem the struggle of the peoples for liberation, because this is a great historical process, occurring with ever-increasing and irreversible force. It is possible to prolong for a year or two the domination of one State by another, but just as feudalism was once replaced by the bourgeois system, just as now the Socialist system is replacing capitalism, so colonial slavery will give way to freedom. These are the laws of humanity's development, and only adventurers can hope that, by mountains of dead bodies and millions of victims, they will be able to hold back the advance of the bright future.

"An end must be put to colonialism, and not only because it brings disaster and suffering upon the peoples of the enslaved countries. It brings disaster and suffering, tears and privations also upon the peoples of the metropolitan countries. Who will say that French mothers, whose children are dying in the fields of Algeria, suffer less than Algerian mothers who are burying their sons in their native soil?

"Now, when the blood of the colonial peoples is flowing freely, one cannot turn away, cannot close one's eyes to this bloodshed and pretend that peace reigns in the world.

"What kind of peace is it when brutal wars are raging —wars which are unequal, in view of the conditions of the belligerents? The troops of the colonial Powers are armed to the teeth with all modern lethal weapons, while the peoples fighting for their liberation are armed with obsolete and primitive arms. But with all wars of extermination waged by the colonialists, victory will be on the side of the peoples which are fighting for their liberation.

"In some countries, although sympathy for the struggle of the oppressed peoples runs high, they are afraid to spoil relations with the colonial Powers, and for this reason do not

raise their voices against the wars of extermination, but reconcile themselves with colonialism.

"Others are colonialists themselves and nothing should be expected from them. The allies of the colonial Powers in aggressive military blocs are supporting the colonial policy with all its crimes.

"As for the majority of humanity, it has long since passed its final verdict upon the colonial regime.

"The Soviet Union, true to its policy of peace and support for the struggle of the oppressed peoples for national independence, a policy proclaimed by the founder of the Soviet State, V. I. Lenin, calls upon the United Nations to raise its voice in defence of the just cause of the liberation of the colonies and to take immediate measures completely to abolish the regime of colonial administration.

"The demand for the complete and final abolition of the colonial regime in every form and manifestation stems from the entire course of world history over the past few decades. This regime is doomed, and its downfall is only a matter of time. In practice, the question now is only whether the funeral of the colonial regime is to be peaceful or to be accompanied by dangerous adventures by those of its supporters who resort to extreme means. The events in the Congo are a fresh reminder of the existing dangers.

Colonialism threatens Peace.

"The United Nations, which is called upon to strengthen peace and the security of the peoples, is duty-bound to do everything in its power to prevent the outbreak of new armed conflicts in Asia, Africa and Latin America as a result of clashes between the colonial Powers and the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. Great Powers may, of course, find themselves involved in the orbit of any such conflict, and then what was at first a local war will grow into a universal, a world war. It is not enough to be on the defensive against colonialist schemes and go through one international crisis after another. It is essential firmly to safeguard mankind from these schemes, to safeguard the world from colonial military adventures. It is imperative to stamp out colonialism once and for all, and throw it into the dustbin of history . . . .

"Isn't it time to go over to the last and victorious offensive against colonialism, just as civilised mankind a century to a century-and-a-half ago took the offensive against the slave-trade and slavery and buried them, thus opening to the broadest scope not only the political but also the economic development of society?

"The Soviety Government considers that the time has come to pose the question of the full and final abolition of colonial rule in every shape and form, so as to put an end to this disgrace, this barbarism and savagery.

"When preparing this statement I knew that not all the participants in the General Assembly session would welcome the Soviet Union's proposals because, along with the representatives of free and independent nations, the session is attended by representatives of the colonial Powers. Can one expect them to acclaim our freedom-loving proposals?

Proposed Soviet Declaration.

"Firmly abiding by the principle that the United Nations is the centre for concerted action by the nations to achieve the common objectives enunciated in its Charter, the Soviet Government submits to this session of the General Assembly a draft declaration, solemnly proclaiming the following demands:

"One. *All colonial countries, all trust and other non-self-governing territories* **should be immediately granted full independence and freedom to build their own national States, in accordance with the expressed will and desire of their peoples.** *The colonial regime and colonial administration in every shape and form should be abolished completely, so as to give the peoples of such territories an opportunity of deciding their own destiny and forms of administration of their countries.*

"Two. *All strongholds of colonialism, in the form of possessions and leased areas on other people's territories, should be abolished.*

"Three. *The Governments of all nations should be called upon to base their relations with other countries on strict and undeviating adherence to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and to the present declaration of equality and respect for the sovereign rights and territorial integrity of all States*

without exception, refraining from any manifestations of colonialism, and claiming no exclusive rights or privileges for certain nations to the detriment of other nations".

The Soviet resolution was not adopted as it stood. But an amended version, sponsored by the Afro-Asian group was eventually adopted by the General Assembly. Not one country voted against it, but nine delegations abstained. They were the U.S.A., Britain, France, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, Belgium, Australia and the American puppet delegation from the Dominican Republic. A brave action was taken by a Negro woman member of the U.S. delegation, who stood up in defiance of instructions and voted with the delegates of other nations. The resolution marked a historic turn in the United Nations, isolating the imperialists and driving another nail into the coffin of imperialism.

PORTUGAL — QUIT AFRICA !

At last the Portuguese colonies have joined the African Revolution. With arms in their hands, the patriots of Angola are fighting for their freedom against the intolerable yoke of Fascist Portugal. The Portuguese dictator, Salazar, tells one lie after another about Angola. "A Communist plot". "Armed terrorists from the Congo". "A Soviet invasion". What rubbish ! All Africa knows the truth. The people of Angola, like those of Mozambique, are ruthlessly exploited by Portuguese settlers, clerical-feudal Catholic church landlords and the Fascist Portuguese state, which exports annually thousands of African slaves to labour on South African gold mines and elsewhere. With the utmost violence and brutality, Salazar's Fascist troops and police suppress every movement of the people demanding their rights and liberties.

The masses of the people of Africa, and those of Portugal as well, headed by the heroic Portuguese Communist Party, are heart and soul with the brave freedom-fighters of Angola, in their struggle against the hated Salazar tyranny.

Portugal must quit Angola — and get out of Mozambique as well.

APARTHEID UNDER FIRE

Apartheid, rightly described in the Moscow Statement of Communist and Workers' Parties as an *"inhuman system of racial persecution and tyranny"* is under heavy fire.

At the March meeting of the Prime Ministers of countries of the so-called "British Commonwealth" a considerable victory was

won by the representatives of African and Asian countries. Despite every effort by Macmillan and Menzies to keep South Africa in, the vigorous condemnations of apartheid made it clear to Dr. Verwoerd that he was not welcome. As a result, South Africa will cease to be in the Commonwealth after May 31, when it will proclaim a White Supremacy "Republic".

Now, "Commonwealth" membership is of no value whatsoever to the newly-independent countries of Africa and Asia; in fact it is merely a badge of their prime servitude which their self-respect should impel them to cast away. But it is of much value to White South Africa, desperately trying to maitain its respectability and international contacts in a world which increasingly shuns its odious system of racial oppression.

It should not be forgotten, however, that while Macmillan describes apartheid as "repugnant" in the House of Commons, and representatives of the United States (whose own hands are not too clean as regards colour discrimination) condemns Verwoerdism at the U.N. — it is precisely the massive British and American investments in South Africa which are the chief props of White Supremacy in that country. And millions of pounds and dollars flow to London and New York, drawn out of the forced labour of Africans in South African mines and industries.

At the United Nations session, too, many harsh and true words have been spoken about South Africa's race policies, her treatment of the Indian minority and her crude annexation and oppression of South-West Africa. Leaders like Dr. Nkrumah and Mr. Mboya have spoken out demanding that not only words but deeds be used, in the form of economic and other sanctions against the South African Government by the nations of the world.

As "Toussaint" points out in this issue of *The African Communist*, such solidarity actions are of great value in the freedom struggle of the people of South Africa, but the final word must rest with the people of the country themselves.

In this connection it is tremendously inspiring to see the fighting spirit of the people of South Africa manifesting itself, despite the mountain of State repression, at the historic all-in African Conference held in Maritzburg on March 24 and 25. Disruptive attempts were made, on the eve of the conference, to sabotage it — by the Pan-Africanist Congress and the Rightist Duncan-Ngubane wing of the Liberal Party. Nevertheless the conference was a great success, and the would-be disrupters succeeded merely in discrediting themselves.

It was decided to demand that the Government convene a democratically-elected National Convention (Constituent Assembly) by May 31, the day set for proclamation of the republic, to draw up a constitution for a free, non-racial South Africa. Failing which the African people, together with other oppressed and democratic South Africans of all races will embark on a mass campaign of demonstrations and refusal to co-operate with the imposed "republic".

It is safe to assume that the government will reject this demand, and that stormy South Africa will witness yet another round of fierce struggles by her heroic and dauntless patriots.

OUR MAGAZINE

We have been tremendously encouraged and inspired by the wonderful response to *The African Communist* in many parts of our great continent. Since we have appointed a London agent (his address appears on the inside back cover) subscriptions and enquiries have been pouring in from all over Africa. Articles from our magazine have been reproduced not only in Africa but in many parts of the world.

To ensure that our magazine is improved and fulfils its function of spreading the inspiring and unconquerable ideas of Marxism-Leninism in Africa, we ask for the help and co-operation of our readers. We ask you :

(1) To order more copies of the magazine and sell them to your friends.

(2) To form study groups to discuss *The African Communist* and to analyse the concrete conditions in your country in the light of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

(3) To prepare, on the basis of these discussions, articles for our magazine and send them to us.

The African Communist is produced under conditions of great difficulty and danger, by the South African Communist Party, as a forum for Marxist-Leninist thought throughout Africa. It can only serve this function properly if it is supported and helped by revolutionary workers and patriots in every corner of Africa.

The choice before New Africa

By N. Numadé

National liberation has made dramatic progress in Africa. Today we have twenty-eight independent States, with populations totalling over 180 millions. When we remember that when the United Nations was founded there were only three — one of them being the Union of South Africa, governed then as now not by the masses of the people but by an imperialistic minority; when we recall that in 1960 alone no less that 16 of these States gained their formal political independence, we gain some idea of the pace and extent of change in our Continent. Of course the battle for independence is far from finished. More than twenty countries, with a combined population of something like 60 million, are still under direct alien rule, with bitter struggles continuing in the Congo, Angola and elsewhere. And the "independence" of some of the young States is rather dubious, to put it politely. Nevertheless even the most diehard reactionaries have been compelled to recognise that the African Revolution is now a fact, that the crucial turning-point has been passed. Independence, freedom and self-government has, in essence been won by the African peoples, and no force in the world can turn them back on the road.

Naturally the future of the African peoples evokes the keenest discussion, not only in this Continent, but throughout the world. What is the direction of our Revolution ? What is its character and driving forces ? Has it exhausted its momentum by the attainment of political independence, or will it drive forward to achieve a social revolution as well ? Will the African countries have to pass through the same process of capitalist development as those of Europe and America, or will they take the socialist road ? Can they remain uncommitted in the "cold war", or will they gravitate towards the capitalist, or the socialist, camp ? These and many similar questions are frequently discussed and written about.

The answers to all such questions depend on the African people themselves. In writing about such matters, imperialist "experts" on Africa tend to forget this all-important fact, and to write as if these were not, above all, our business, and indeed as if we are all illiterate and unable to obtain their writings.

THE WAY THEY PUT IT

Let us examine some of these discussions by colonialist writers.

"Optima" is the mouthpiece of the Anglo-American Corporation — the vast Oppenheimer mining octopus that sprawls over Southern and East Africa. In the December, 1960, issue of this journal, Sir Charles Arden-Clarke, former Governor-General of Ghana, writes : —

> "The future of European enterprise, capital and settlement in Africa is naturally the subject of much discussion. South of the Sahara, *European leadership, both economic and political, has made African countries what they are and guided them to nationhood.* Political leadership in the main is ending. Will economic leadership end also ? Or will it continue, *perhaps in a different form,* to develop and enrich the newly independent countries of Africa ? On the answer to this depends not only *the security of millions of money already invested* and of many individuals on the European side but on the African, the future well-being of the people. For it is scarcely in dispute that the resources of Africa cannot be developed without a massive influx of outside capital, skill and planning. Argument does not centre around whether this is the case; it centres around where the capital and skill are to come from and on what terms".
>
> (My italics — N.N.)

Noting that already 30,000 African students are in the socialist countries, and that Guinea has negotiated a loan of £9 million from the People's Republic of China, Sir Charles concludes that :

> "A new and powerful anti-western influence is entering the scene. The non-communist west cannot afford to see Africa go over to its **rivals".**

It is hardly necessary, one hopes, to point out to readers of this journal how preposterous are Sir Charles's claims for "European leadership" (by which he means imperialist conquest and domination) in Africa. Such "leadership" led to the decline of the population of the Congo by over fifty per cent. during the sixty years of Belgian rule, and similar results in the rest of our Continent; it led to the organised looting of the wealth of Africa to swell the riches of the capitalists of Western Europe and the United States. But what need is there to argue ? The bitter fruits of colonialism are there for all to see — the simple fact that Africa, like Asia and South America, has the lowest wages, the longest hours of work, the shortest life-expectancy, the most illiteracy and the highest death-rate of any part of the world. True, indeed, "European leadership" has made the African countries "what they are". But Sir Charles should hardly expect us to thank him and his kind for that, or expect us to look to them for our "future well-being". Obviously, what he is really concerned about, however, is not our well-being, but the security of the "millions of money

invested" by the imperialists (money, by the way, on which they have already reaped dividends worth many times the original investments) and the danger of African socialism to the "non-communist west".

This is a favourite theme, also, with American writers. Mr. Chester Bowles, well-known spokesman of United States imperialism, writes in his book "The Coming Political Breakthrough" that the root of the trouble in the modern world is the backwardness and poverty of the millions in Africa, Asia and South America. The primary task of the United States, he writes, is

> "to rally other non-communist people to the common defence of certain primary principles of human conduct which are deeply rooted in most religions which have provided the central driving force for human freedom and betterment since the beginning of time".

On careful examination of these high-sounding "principles", one is hardly surprised to find that they add up to the single principle of capitalism; and that the only "freedom" really treasured by Mr. Bowles is the "freedom" to exploit human labour. Other Americans are less flowery in their language. Mr. Victor von Lossberg, former American Consul in South Africa, said that "*Africa is one of the last frontiers for private enterprise*".

AFRICA THEIR PRESERVE

Indeed, this concept of Africa as a "frontier" or "battlefield" for Western capitalism crops up repeatedly in the writings of imperialist journalists. "Newsweek", the U.S. business journal declared (January 23, 1961) that Washington's African problem is that :

> "Young and inexperienced nations are determined to leap forward in the jet age — no matter how. They will take any help they can get, and Russia is moving into *what was once a Western preserve*".
>
> (My italics — N.N.)

And Mr. Oliver Woods, Colonial Editor of the London "Times" wrote (Optima, September, 1959) :

> "The countries of the free world are less ambitious today than they were ten years ago in seeking to attach "uncommitted" peoples to alliances against the Russians. They would be well content with a neutralist Africa, provided it were really neutral. It is becoming clearly understood that aid to undeveloped countries cannot be regarded *merely* as an incentive to siding with the west but must be given for its own sake, in a *more or less* altruistic attempt to level up standards of living. In the long term, such a policy, by removing deep-seated resentments against industrialised western powers would of course tend towards *the same object of preserving non-committed countries from being swallowed up by the communist world*".
>
> (My italics — N.N.)

These passages reveal the common language of the representatives of American and British imperialism in the era when colonialism is rapidly collapsing under the impact of the socialist world system and the national liberation movements of the people. Bluntly, and stripped of their verbiage and euphemisis, the imperialist statements add up to this : That they still regard Africa as their *preserve*. That though, after years of fierce struggle by the national liberation movements, they have been forced to give up direct political rule, they are now seeking every possible intrigue and method to retain economic domination and exploitation in Africa. Why ?

Firstly, they seek to continue to rob the African people of their natural resources and the fruits of their labour; to continue to draw super-profits from "the millions of money which has already been invested" as Arden-Clarke puts it.

Secondly, they want to preserve Africa as "the last frontier of private enterprise"; to prop up the tottering system of capitalism in a world where socialism is on the ascendancy, by attempting to arrest the African Revolution and prevent its natural transition from national liberation to socialism.

Thirdly, the imperialists hope to buy over African political leaders and bourgeois elements on to their side in the cold war; to make use of African bases, materials and man-power in the aggressive military plots they are hatching against the Soviet Union, People's China and other countries of the socialist camp.

COLLECTIVE IMPERIALISM

So bitter and deep are the rivalries between the different imperialist States that they have already brought about two terrible world wars, and unless the vigilance of the millions of peace-loving peoples is constantly maintained, could bring about a third.

Yet, despite these rivalries, the imperialists are capable at times of combining their forces in their common hatred of socialism and national liberation, and when they feel the capitalist system as a whole is threatened. A striking illustration of this was the period at the end of the first world war when the capitalist countries — which the moment before had been at each others' throats — joined forces in the attempt to strangle the young Soviet Republic in blood in the wars of intervention.

Another example is fresh in our minds — the tragedy of the Congo, where U.S., Belgian, British, French, West German, South

African and other imperialists have combined — falsely sailing their pirate craft under the colours of the United Nations — in an atrocious attempt to destroy the young Republic and fragment it into weak and powerless puppet regimes.

The spokesmen and apologists for the imperialist powers do their best to prettify the "new colonialism"; to present it as benign and peaceful, showering gifts of independence and aid on grateful Africans. But the Congo has opened the eyes of Africa. It has shown "neo-colonialism" as being as ruthless and brutal as the old colonialism. Nor does it help the colonialists to try and hide behind the "neutral" Dag Hammarskjöld, or the "Africans" Tshombe and Mobutu. We can see you quite clearly behind the scenes, gentlemen, the murderers of our hero and martyr, Patrice Lumumba.

WHY THEY MUST FAIL

There are a good many reasons why all the clever plans and stratagems of "neo-colonialism" and "collective imperialism" are doomed to disgraceful failure in Africa.

For one thing this "collective imperialism" cannot work. However well it may seem on paper, the colonial powers are by nature incapable of keeping out of each other's gardens. It takes a really desperate crisis, like that of the Congo, to bring them together even for a short time, and even in the Congo it can be prophesised with confidence that they will soon be openly snarling over the spoils and leaping at one another's throat's like dogs fighting over a juicy bone. In most parts of Africa, British and American commercial and diplomatic missions are barely on speaking terms with one another. West German and Japanese trade representatives are undercutting their rivals in African markets and seriously irritating their American masters. A silent, but nevertheless grim and merciless, struggle for predominance is taking place between the two chief colonial powers in Africa, Britain and France. De Gaulle will never forgive Britain for extending (through Ghana) a loan to Guinea, at a crucial moment in the newborn Republic's struggle for independence.

For another, the western imperialists, filled with racial arrogance, are so accustomed to regarding Africans as hopelessly stupid people, utterly incapable of running our own affairs, that they seriously underestimate our capacity for elementary common sense and observation of simple facts. For example, they keep on

warning us against the "Communist menace", the "danger of being swallowed by Russia" and so on. But we know there is not and never has been a single Russian, Chinese or other socialist military base, soldier, sailor or airforce man on the entire continent; or a single businessman or farmer from these countries to take over our land and natural resources, tax us, corrupt our chiefs or bully us into working for them. Again, they keep informing us how grateful we ought to be to them for conferring the priceless gift of freedom on us. Do they think we are so stupid not to know that this freedom is precisely freedom *from them* — and that only after bitter and often bloody struggles for many years ? Certainly, if you have been sitting on a man's back, and at last he manages to throw you off, he will be happy and relieved. But it is asking for a bit too much to expect him to say "Thank you" ! The main service the colonialists have rendered to Africa is to clear out — if they would go more quickly we might be more grateful.

AFRICA IS NOT FOR SALE

But the chief flaw in all the imperialists' plans and speculations about Africa — and the main reason for their impending utter bankruptcy — is their completely wrong and unrealistic *approach* to the entire question. They regard Africa as a mere pawn in the game of power-politics, whose fate will be decided somewhere else; or as a "prize" in an auction sale, destined to go to the highest bidder. Who can offer more, they ask — we of "the west", or "Russia" ?

It goes without saying that this vulgar and small-minded concept — so revealing of the outlook of its capitalist authors, whose only god is money — is profoundly insulting to the dignity and national pride of the African peoples. We have not achieved independence, at the cost of generations of suffering and sacrifice, in order to sell it away for dollars, francs, sterling or gold — gold which in any case has come, for the most part, from the mines of Africa. Certainly the African countries need economic assistance, equipment and skills, in order rapidly to overcome the colonial heritage of backwardness. It is indeed our right to demand such assistance, as some small recompense for the untold wealth which has been drained out of this continent. But if the price for assistance is the loss of our new-won freedom we shall rather do without it, and rely on our own strength and brains. And any Tshombes among us who try to barter away our birthright will have to face the wrath of the people. Africa is not for sale.

The key to the future of Africa lies in Africa itself; in the

nature of the national freedom struggle in this era of world history; in the driving forces of the African Revolution. And that is precisely what the imperialists do not understand and are incapable of understanding. An analysis of *these* factors will show us that if Africa is indeed "one of the last frontiers" of capitalism, it is one that will be hard to defend. Without underestimating the still powerful resources of imperialism, and the desperate measures it will resort to, it can yet be said that the outlook for capitalism is bleak in Africa, and that for socialism bright indeed.

THE DRIVE TOWARDS SOCIALISM

The drive towards socialism in Africa arises not from some remote "game" of power-politics in foreign countries, but out of the urgent needs and bitter experiences of the African peoples themselves. Certainly, the African people are deeply appreciative of the fine stand taken by Comrade Khrushchov and other Communist leaders over colonialism, the Congo, and all other main issues affecting the future of Africa. They will never forget the noble and disinterested aid afforded by the Soviet Union, China and the other lands of socialism in the development and industrialisation of our continent, fittingly symbolised by the Aswan dam. But it is not because of gratitude, or admiration, or because of the "export of revolution" from the socialist camp, that Africans are more and more turning to socialist solutions.

It is because socialism, and only socialism, is capable of rapidly transforming and modernising Africa, of solving our burning and desperate problems.

We know that it is socialism — that is, the conquest of State power by the workers and peasants led by the Communist Party, the common ownership of the means of production, making possible bold and imaginative planning — which has enabled People's China, one of the world's most poverty-stricken areas in a brief decade to become the land of the Great Leap Forward in industry and agriculture, of soaring living and cultural standards.

We know how socialism has transformed the life of the people in the former colonies of Tsarist Russia, so that the Soviet Republic of Kazakhstan, for instance, a once-backward Asian border region, has multiplied its industrial production sixty times and now produces as much manufactured goods per head as Italy, as much electric power as Japan ! And this is true of all the former backward regions of the old Tsarist empire, where illiteracy has been wiped out, where universities and higher technical schools

abound (there are 88 university and 73 technical school pupils per 10,000 population in Soviet Central Asia as against 40 in France, 34 in Italy and 31 in West Germany!) and where the rate of development has been even higher than that of the rest of the U.S.S.R.

These lessons are not being lost; nor those of the daily impact of the ever-continuing struggle against imperialism both in the independent states and in the remaining colonial and semi-colonial areas. No one who seriously studies trends and developments in the African liberation movement can fail to be aware of the increasingly radical direction they are taking, of the growing influence of socialist ideas.

There was a time when Ghana prohibited Marxist literature; but today the C.P.P. itself is encouraging Marxist-Leninist studies for its members, and the Hon. Tawia Adamifo, General Secretary of the Convention People's Party wrote in "The Voice of Africa" (December 29, 1960) :

> "This year 1960 which is ending fast, has been aptly described as Africa's year of destine, a year in which, despite imperialist manoeuvres and intrigues, a large number of former dependent countries in Africa have broken the yoke of imperialism, thus establishing the fact that Africa shall never perpetually remain the pawn in the chess of imperialist oppression. This year has also witnessed capitalist sabotage of the worst type in the Congo, where vested interests, aided and abetted by their lackeys and hirelings in the United Nations and the quislings in the Congo, are trying to shatter the hard-won freedom of the Congolese people with a view to perpetuating Belgian rule".

In the same issue of "The Voice of Africa", Mr. John Tettegah, first secretary of the preparatory committee of the All-Africa Trade Union Federation and secretary general of the Ghana T.U.C. declared that this decade stands, above all else,

> "for the total eradication of imperialism, colonialism, capitalism and exploitation from the shores of Africa".

A similar sharp awareness of the tie-up between colonialism and capitalist interests was shown in the editorial of the *Congo News* of November 11, 1960 :

> "Support (for Kalonje) has come not only from Belgian Big Business. British capital has a vital interest in the Union Miniere, and American firms hold 25 per cent. of the stock of Forminiere, the company exploiting the rich Kasai diamond mines".

The Congo events, however tragic, have had a powerful educational effect all over Africa. The Steering Committee of the All-African People's Conference, meeting at Dar-es-Salaam

(January 26 to 30, 1961) adopted a resolution, in which it

> "underlines the vital lesson which came out of the Congolese experience regarding all countries which attained independence, and whose leaders must show vigilance towards the plots perpetrated by imperialism and neo-colonialism.
>
> "The Steering Committee warns the African people, the African governments, political parties and trade unions on the trend which neo-colonialism has taken throughout last year. The efforts of the imperialists have been directed towards re-colonisation or continued colonisation after the people have attained their nominal independence. They have used and are using means of control whereby some of the newly freed nations continue to serve the aims and objectives of the colonisers.
>
> "As long as their influence, whether political, economic, military or otherwise remains within an African country, there can never be a real expression of the peoples objectives and aspirations".

The resolution sharply criticised the voting of certain African states at the United Nations on the Congo and Algeria. "The peoples of Africa never stood for Kasavubu or Tshombe", it says, "or for that matter, De Gaulle". It declared that the voting of these States (clearly certain African members of the so-called French Community are indicated) was "contrary to the will of the peoples", and due mainly "to the policies of neo-colonialism".

Of course, one must be careful not to overstate the position. There are still many African leaders who harbour naive illusions about imperialism and especially about the so-called British Commonwealth and French Community — they imagine that the imperialist tiger has lost its teeth; or forget that when the imperialist invites you to sit down at a table with him he is still hankering to have a meal off *you*! Some think it is quite compatible with political morality to make fiery speeches in public denouncing colonialism today, and to sit down with the very colonialist the next day and have a private chat with him about "the Communist menace" or even about "the Native mentality". Others, again, are quite willing to accept handouts from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, or the American State Department, or Moral Rearmament; they think they are being clever, or even helping the liberation movement, but imperceptibly they slip into positions of treachery towards Africa.

Then we find bourgeois elements, landlords, petty feudal or tribal leaders whose fear of the awakened people is such that they throw patriotism to the winds and do serious harm to Africa's cause in their efforts to stave off revolution and maintain their exploitation of African labour. Nasser's cruel jails are crammed

with patriotic Communists, trade unionists and Syrian and Egyptian democrats; nor is his the only country of New Africa where workers' parties and trade unions are forbidden, or only permitted as a tame agency of a capitalist state.

But such negative factors are not characteristic of the new Africa that is being born. They are unpleasant; they hold back the tide of emancipation and progress; but essentially they are hangovers from the colonialist past, with its repression of fighters for freedom, its cultivation of servile mental attitudes that worship everything Western and despise everything African, its calculated policy of preserving backward tribal and feudal institutions.

The *main* direction of the national liberation movement in Africa is—decidedly and increasingly—democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist. More and more Africans are coming to understand that we cannot stop short at formal independence and the trappings of Western bourgeois parliamentarism; that if it is to fulfil its goal of emancipating the peoples fully from the accursed heritage of imperialism our Revolution must sweep forward uninterruptedly to accomplish the socialist transformation of African society.

In this, our position differs markedly from that of Europe and America during the bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. There, having achieved power for themselves, the ruling capitalist classes turned conservative and reactionary, and the workers and peasants who had fought for freedom found that its benefits were mainly confined to the rich.

This marked difference stems from the character of the period in which we live, as well as from the specific and urgent needs of the African peoples, their class character, their aims and aspirations.

A TIME OF TRANSITION

The chief content of the era in which we live is the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism, a transition which was initiated by the great socialist revolution of November 7, 1917 in Russia. Our epoch has been correctly characterised by the historic Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties of November, 1960, as

> "a time of struggle between two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial

> system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale".

We are living in the midst of "the rapid growth and might of the international influence of the world socialist system", "the vigorous process of disintegration of the colonial system, under the impact of the national liberation movement", intensification of class struggles and the decline and decay of capitalism. "The superiority of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism, of the forces of peace over those of war, is becoming ever more marked in the world arena".

> "Today it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism for a socialist transformation of society *that determine the main content, main trend* and main features of the historic development of society. Whatever efforts imperialism makes, it cannot stop the advance of history. A reliable basis has been provided for further decisive victories for socialism. The complete triumph of socialism is inevitable".

It is against the background of this historical development in the world that the character and potentiality of the national liberation movements in Africa must be assessed — movements that are developing in an era where socialism has become the decisive factor. The superiority of the socialist system is being demonstrated daily in the competition between the two systems in the fields of economic construction and technology, of the rapid and sweeping advance of the people's living standards and cultural levels — fields which are of decisive importance to Africa and other colonial and recently-colonial areas.

These solid facts help to account for the steady and irresistable advance of socialist ideas among the national liberation movements, the workers, peasants and patriotic intellectuals of awakened Africa.

THE NATURE OF OUR FREEDOM MOVEMENTS

Africa is a big continent with many countries, at different stages of economic and political development, and one must beware of over-sweeping generalisations. Its peoples vary from simple tribal communities almost untouched by the sweep of modern developments, isolated feudal societies, to the advanced class-conscious proletariat of great cities like Johannesburg in the South.

Yet, broadly speaking, certain observations are true of practically the whole Continent.

One of these it that — due to the nature of imperialist domination over Africa — most African countries lack a sub-

stantial, well-established and experienced class of industrial and financial capitalists. Not only is the over-all level of industrialisation very low; but where there has been development of large-scale mining, capitalistically managed agricultural plantations, industry and banking, it has been carried out by the colonisers for their own benefit and the profits siphoned off to Europe and North America. Even in the area of the greatest industrialisation — in South Africa — the white minority, acting as a sort of internal imperialist group, have strictly retained all economic opportunities in their own hands, and Africans have been as strictly excluded from the ranks of the mining, financial and industrial bourgeoisie as they have been from Parliament.

Therefore the ranks of the freedom movement in Africa do not to any significant extent contain such elements as, for example, the big bourgeois Tata and Birla groups in the Indian National Congress, which have grown to dominate that organisation and hold Nehru virtually their prisoner.

Workers, peasants, patriotic intellectuals, small businessmen and professional men, traders and independent craftsmen — such are the overwhelming bulk of the members of the patriotic liberation movements in Africa. None of these groups have a serious vested interest in the maintenance of capitalism.

The winning of political independence must be rapidly followed up by rapid industrialisation in the newly-independent states. Even the colonialist powers are committed to assist in this process, if for no other reason than that of their fear of the socialist countries providing more effective assistance on more favourable terms.

And such industrialisation of course means the rapid growth of the African proletariat, the most determined and clear-headed fighters for socialism, the intensification of the class struggle in the former colonies, and the continent-wide development of a powerful Marxist-Leninist movement, the most far-sighted, uncompromising and determined enemy of colonialism in all its forms.

IMPERIALISM CAN'T WIN

Imperialism, whatever stratagems and devices, such as neo-colonialism and collective imperialism, it may adopt cannot in the long run win the battle for Africa. It stands in direct conflict with the aspirations of all classes of the people. It has been directly challenged and defeated in the ideological field, as when, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly of the United Nations utterly condemned colonialism — none voting against and

only the imperialist countries abstaining. Its plans for preventing the industrialisation of Africa and for continued exploitation of African resources and cheap labour in high-profit investments are increasingly challenged and thwarted by the willingness of the socialist countries to extend truly fraternal assistance to the young African states; assistance directed to enable them to industrialise themselves, rendered without any conditions which undermine the national independence of the people, and at generously low rates of repayment.

These, then, are the conditions which open up glowing possibilities for the national liberation movement to carry forward the revolt against colonialism into a true revolution against imperialism and the capitalist system, for the vast upliftment and transformation of the lives of the masses of our poverty-stricken, illiterate, ill-housed, underfed and disease-ridden people, through the planning and building of a Socialist Africa.

However, no-one should underestimate the difficulties of these tasks, of the struggles and trials which still lie ahead of us. For the fulfilment of the next phase of our Revolution, more is required than the mass, amorphous, multi-class liberation movements, lacking a common ideology and a firm discipline — well though such movements have served us so far. It is also needed that we build, in firm alliance with the national liberation movements, political parties uniting the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals, parties firmly based on the working class, trained and disciplined, armed and equipped with the victorious theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. Only such Parties, consciously applying the general theory of Communism to the study and solution of the special problems of the various countries and areas of the Continent, can speedily and successfully carry our African Revolution to its logical and necessary conclusion.

That conclusion, it is clear from the foregoing, can only be socialism. This arises both from the present world-historical development towards socialism and from the urgent needs of Africa itself. The imperialists' attempts to stifle this development cannot in the long run succeed; but they can delay our advance unless we in Africa are clear-sighted and resolute to oppose them; and unless we create true Marxist-Leninist Parties, based upon the best elements among the workers and peasants, working in alliance and loyal partnership with the militant national liberation movements of Africa.

Some thoughts on Federation

By A. Zanzolo

During the celebration of Nigerian Independence at Lagos in October last year Mr. Julius Nyerere, leader of the Tanganyika African National Union, made a startling proposal. He indicated that Tanganyika would be prepared to delay the achievement of independence if this would facilitate the creation of an East African Federation comprising the territories of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika.

Within weeks of making the statement Mr. Nyerere utilised the opportunity afforded by a conference of PAFMECA* held at Mbale in Uganda to elaborate further on his viewpoint. Furthermore under the influence of Mr. Nyerere the conference accepted the principle of a greater federation which would include all the territories of East and Central Africa.

In the course of the Mbale conference the delegates of the Tanganyika African National Union had tried to urge the organisations from the Central African Federation to negotiate with the British government for the preservation of the Central African Federation on the basis of the Monkton Commission proposals which had just been published. In other words they were being urged to drop their opposition to the continued existence of the Central African Federation. This idea was strenuously opposed by delegates from the Federation. It was partly to circumvent this opposition that Mr. Nyerere produced his trump card — a giant federation stretching from Southern Rhodesia to Uganda.

Now, the Tanganyika African National Union is a powerful organisation having virtually no opposition in Tanganyika. And Mr. Nyerere not only by reason of his leadership of this organisation but also because of his undoubted gifts is a man of considerable influence and prestige in Africa. His policies are generally progressive and he has the merit of not participating in any opportunistic anti-communist campaign . . . a popular pastime

*PAFMECA is the Pan-African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa It co-ordinates the activities of all national liberatory organisations in that region.

with certain Nationalist leaders in Africa who ought to know better. For the above reasons it is particularly necessary that his views on federation which contain certain serious errors should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. Moreover these ideas have been accepted in principle by liberatory organisations in East and Central Africa thus extending the scope of the errors contained in them.

ALL-AFRICAN UNITY

It is as well to point out that the various federations being proposed by African leaders, more often than not are regarded by them as forming part and parcel of the concept of *Pan-African Unity*. These federations are seen as regional combinations that will eventually merge in a grand United States of Africa.

It is not possible, within the framework of this short article, to attempt a full treatment of the attitude which African Communists and other progressive patriots should adopt towards this concept; but perhaps a few general considerations should be set out.

The idea of Pan-African unity has a long tradition among the liberation movements of this Continent. It is often regarded as having originated among the American Negroes. As early as the nineteenth century the Ethopian Church movement in South Africa, which had strong U.S. affiliations, was a strong protagonist of Pan-African ideas. And the first Pan-African Congress of 1919 in Paris, attended by many representatives of African organisations, including the African National Congress of South Africa, met under the inspiration of the great American Negro thinker, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois.

The whole concept has received tremendous impetus and become of great practical importance with the growing strength of the liberation struggles in Africa and the emergence of many independent states on the Continent. It is important for all of us to realise the tremendous appeal which it makes to African people.

Pan-African unity is essentially a progressive idea, springing out of historically-developed conditions. The imperialist scramble for Africa resulted in the arbitrary division of the continent among the various European powers. The boundaries drawn on the face of Africa reflected the balance of forces among the occupying powers; they did not correspond to the desires of the African people, nor to the geographical, national, linguistic, ethnic or

historical facts of Africa. People belonging to the same group or tribe found themselves of different sides of a boundary. Groups with no cultural or linguistic affinity were lumped together.

It must be remembered that, on the whole, the imperialists did not find stable nations in Africa — using "nation" in the scientific sense of an historically evolved community living within stable boundaries, and under a specific economy — that of *capitalism* — with its unifying factors of a common market and the liquidation of tribalism and feudalism.

Many of the states which have recently arisen, or are about to arise, within the boundaries negotiated among themselves by the former imperialist masters of our Continent, are artificial territorial units, enjoying no historical local loyalties from their inhabitants, and often not economically or politically viable in the modern world.

An even more important factor in impelling African unity is the common struggle against the imperialist colonisers — a struggle which still goes on even more intensely, despite certain naive illusions to the contrary. Apart from the many countries which still remain under colonialist domination, including the Portuguese colonies and the whole South-Eastern area of Africa, the imperialists, headed by those of the United States are making an intensive drive to replace the direct political domination of Africa with its economic enslavement. It was the essential understanding of this continued threat which lay behind the 1958 Declaration of African states at Accra solemnly proclaiming and asserting "unity among ourselves and our solidarity with the dependent peoples as well as our friendship with all nations".

These are some of the concrete factors which have resulted in a very strong urge for unity on a continental scale. To the extent that this is a progressive anti-imperialist force it must be fostered and supported.

It must be admitted that both in the past and today there are forces which desire to distort the true object of Pan-African Unity and to turn it into a reactionary force. Such, for instance are those who wish to present Pan-African Unity as an anti-communist force. Also the essentially anti-imperialist nature of Pan-African Unity is sometimes sought to be obscured by various obscurantist myths or concepts which suggest divine origins for Pan-African Unity or seek to explain it in ill-defined philosophies such as are extolled in magazines like *Presence Africain*. The description of

policies as being based on the "African Personality" is one such idea.

INDEPENDENCE COMES FIRST

The fundamental basis and aim sustaining the idea of Pan-African Unity is the achievement of self-determination for all the African people. This means the power of the people to choose. It means freedom to take decisions which benefit the people. It means independence.

And that is the cardinal error made by Mr. Nyerere.

An examination of the position in those countries which he suggests must be federated is that none of them is independent. They are all under the control of an imperialist power, Britain. They cannot decide anything without having to bear in mind the views and interests of the imperial power.

Far from regarding this circumstance as a disadvantage the Tanganyika leaders see it almost as a virtue. In colourful and humorous terms Mr. Nyerere himself paints a picture of a proud newly independent state complete with cabinet, flag, national anthem and a seat at the United Nations. Such a state, he says, will indignantly reject any suggestion that it surrender its newly-found sovereignty in order to join a federation. Reasoning thus, independence becomes an obstacle to unity !

Clearly the suggestion is that federation must be considered and decided upon under the auspices and with the support of the imperialist power, out to prevent the emergence of a federation that is in the interests of the people. And this power will be sitting in as a potent factor in the negotiations for a federation of African states.

To meet this formidable obstacle the PAFMECA conference resolution on this matter stated that a condition of the plan was the existence of "popular governments" in all the territories. It is not clear what was meant by this. But certainly it did not mean governments elected on the basis of universal suffrage in independent states. It most likely meant governments formed after elections held in terms of constitutions drawn by the imperialists in which a sizeable majority of voters were African.

While it is wrong to regard independence as the obstacle to federation and unity it is also true that independence will not automatically result in unity. There are other factors that come into play. It might be convenient to consider separately the

proposal for an East African federation and the one for a greater federation of all the central and East African territories. The two proposals are essentially different.

EAST AFRICAN FEDERATION

There may be much merit in the proposal for an East African Federation uniting Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar and Tanganyika. The imperialists have treated the region as a unit for economic purposes and there is thus a common currency, postal and transport system. There is a lingua franca — Swahili. Yet there are also difficulties in such a scheme. The territories are at different levels of economic and political development. In Uganda, for instance there is the kingdom of Buganda whose opposition to an East African Federation led to a serious crisis in 1953 and the exile of the Kabaka. There are the minority Asian and European groups who play an important if not a dominant role in the economy. Very serious rivalries exist between the rising African bourgeoisie and the Asian and European bourgeoisie. These and other formidable obstacles exist, but they can be overcome by a progressive plan, democratically decided.

An independent Tanganyika dedicated to the achievement of East African Federation and prepared to use its resources for that purpose could play a determining role in such a plan. An independent Tanganyika would as a first step be able to assist in the liberation of the other territories so that federation is discussed with the real leaders of the people. Mr. Nyerere today cannot meet Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya without obtaining leave from the British government. A similar situation obtains in Uganda where important leaders have been "rusticated" or exiled to remote parts of the country. How can realistic decisions on federation be taken in these circumstances ?

DIVERSIONARY

The other idea of a federation comprising all of East and Central Africa seems far-fetched and is in the present situation diversionary. It seems to be substituting diplomatic negotiations with the British for militant struggle for freedom. The dismemberment of the present Central African Federation is now essential even for a future greater federation of African states. How will a Central African Federation dominated by the Oppeinheimer mining interests and the Welenskys join in this greater African Federa-

tion ? How can such a federation even be thought of without freedom and independence of the Africans in Central Africa ?

After all, what in fact has placed unity of Africa on the agenda ? What has considerably facilitated the urge to solidarity and unity ? It is precisely the freedom struggle and the emergence of African states. The Independent states are a more reliable starting point or nucleus for building African unity and federations than colonies or dependencies.

Finally it does seem as if a warning is called for against current fallacies about imperialism implicit in the idea of federation before independence. No doubt these fallacies have gained currency as a result of the new tactics whereby imperialism is allegedly "granting" independence to former colonies. The imperialists are not leaving Africa of their own free-will. The nature of imperialism has not changed from that of a predatory system for the exploitation of the peoples. Furthermore, as the Congo events have shown imperialism is prepared to employ brutal force and to connive at the murder of prime ministers of independent states where its interests are threatened.

Schemes which depend on the goodwill of imperialists are unreliable and dangerous to Africa. Any federation that is not based on the free will and consent of independent people will be inherently unstable as the ill-fated Central African Federation has shown. Independence must be achieved before we consider any larger aggregations. Imperialism must be driven out of the continent before unity can be achieved.

(Contributions from readers are invited discussing this stimulating article by Mr. Zanzolo — EDITOR).

"ZIK" ON POLITICAL ILLITERACY

"Anyone who is an intellectual or politician who has not read the works of Karl Marx is a political illiterate".

DR. NNAMDI AZIKIWE, Governor-General of Nigeria, speaking at Ibadan University, November 20, 1960.

Solidarity with South Africa

By Toussaint

"This meeting . . indignantly condemns the inhuman system of racial persecution and tyranny in the Union of South Africa (apartheid) and urges democrats throughout the world actively to support the peoples of South Africa in their struggle for freedom and equality".

From the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow : November, 1960.

One of the most impressive international demonstrations of solidarity of our times has been the world movement of support for the people of South Africa, against the extreme racialist oppression of their government. The demonstration has been made on different levels — governmental, through the United Nations, Afro-Asian Conferences and the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference; organisational, through the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the Communist Parties' Meeting in Moscow; individual through the consumers boycotts of South African goods in many countries. The demonstration has thus taken many forms. In the United Nations general assembly, it has taken the form of a forthright condemnation of South African apartheid, and a call for the Union government to bring its policies into line with the UN Declaration of Fundamental Human Rights. In the Trusteeship Council, it has taken the form of action to counter the expansion of South African apartheid to South West Africa, and of a court action before the International Court of Justice to declare the territory subject to UN Trusteeship. In African and Asian countries, it has taken the form of either state or privately sponsored boycotts or embargoes on South African trade. The ICFTU has now called on the United Nations to impose sanctions on South Africa. The movement is still growing and broadening out into new fields.

The few divisive voices which have been raised outside of South Africa against this mounting campaign of international solidarity have been based on the statements that reaction rules in other countries no less than it rules in South Africa; that racial policies are pursued in several countries outside of South Africa; that there is therefore something inconsistent, an air of "victimisation" in singling out South Africa for the specialised and consistent

attack to which its government is now subject. This argument has been seize on and repeated *ad nauseam* by the representatives of the South African government. Foreign Minister Eric Louw, at the last session of the UN, attempted thus to defend his own government by detailing instances of race discrimination — real or imagined — and of police brutality against the people in a number of member states of UN. Dr. Verwoerd, the Prime Minister of South Africa, repeated this form of argument after his recent rebuff by the Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London, referring to several Commonwealth countries, all with non-white governments where " . . . oppression and discrimination are openly practised and where the basic principles of democratic government are flouted".

THE SPECIAL CASE

Whether there is any substance in any of these allegations or not is completely irrelevant. South Africa is a special case in the world today — and it is recognised universally as such, whatever blotches there might be on the escutcheons of others. It is special because here alone race discrimination is being extended and intensified, while elsewhere in the world it is being slowly or rapidly broken down and abolished. It is special because here the acts of government violence against the people are not isolated, occasional occurences, but a systematic matter of policy decided upon as the only means by which white racialism can be maintained in power. It is special because here the level of economic development exists already to raise the entire population from mediaeval backwardness, and only the ruling class dependence on race-oppression prevents the leap forward being made.

The world condemnation of South Africa's government policies does not arise solely from the particular excesses of the particular government of the day. The white Nationalist government, admittedly, has carried South Africa's system of colonial-type oppression to its extremes. But, in fact, it has built upon the legacy left it by previous, non-Nationalist governments. The pass laws are not a Nationalist invention; the excesses of brutality and police violence with which they are administered, and their extension to African women are. The expropriation of the African majority from the land, and their confinement in rural reserves of poverty is not a Nationalist innovation; the imposition of venal and corrupt "Bantu Authorities" and their gangs of armed hirelings over the reserve people are. White supremacy, and the complete exclusion

of the non-white majority from any share in the social, political or economic privileges of citizenship is not a Nationalist deviation from the South African tradition; the final closing of all doors to any peaceful or constitutional advance to citizenship is.

What the world condemns in South Africa is first and foremost its whole social and economic system. Only as the most virulent and reactionary upholders, extenders and defenders of that system does the Nationalist government specifically come to be the target for the world's hostility. In many ways it is a typically colonial system. It depends on the gross exploitation of the labour of the African population in agriculture and mining, for the enrichment of white South African and foreign exploiters. The entire political and social superstructure of the country has developed on this base; it has been designed to maintain power in the hands of that white colonialist group; it has maintained the most rigid system of labour control; it has maintained feudal-type social relations, with the peasantry tied to the land and deprived of free movement; it has converted the popular, democratic content of tribal custom and tribal institutions into a weapon of despotic indirect rule over the African peoples.

COLONIALISM OF A SPECIAL TYPE

And yet, the South African system is not typical. Its peculiar character arises from the fact that the alien colonialist group which exploits the country and its people, lives largely side by side with them within the borders of the same territory. From this fact arises the special character of South Africa's system. Where the typical colonial country is ruled with an air of paternalism from abroad, South Africa is ruled by a white aristocracy from at home. Where typical colonial countries have been encouraged by imperialism to develop at least a small class of indigenous bourgeoisie, administrators, 'assimilados' and bureaucrats, in South Africa the aim has been to preserve these positions exclusively for the white aristocracy, and thus rigidly to bar any possible development of any section of the African population. Where *foreign* imperialism has been able to preserve the myth that it regards the native peoples as equals — albeit, rather backward equals requiring to be tutored, directed and led — *home* imperialism, as in South Africa, has been driven to the most blatant and naked racialism, to social, political and even religious dogmas of 'black inferiority', in order to preserve its position. (The latest edict of the South African government forbids non-whites from raising the South African flag on the

flagstaffs of official buildings, as such action is 'disrespectful' of the national flag). The *invisible* links of capital which tie the typical colonial country to its overseas exploiters are here the *visible* links of the master-race, of undisguised racialism resting on the use of unbridled force. It is this that makes South Africa a special case in the eyes of the world.

This special character has had special effects — or perhaps equally special causes — in the field of South Africa's economic development. Elsewhere, imperialism has drawn off all the profits and wealth derived from the exploitation of the people and returned that wealth to the imperialist country; thus, the typical colonial country has remained desperately poor; there has been no accumulation of capital in the country itself, and thus no capital resources from which to develop local industry, no glaring local contrast between rich and poor. Not so South Africa. Here, despite the fact that the original and main capital investments in the country were made from abroad (and thus, a heavy tribute is paid annually abroad — as, or example, 35% of all gold mining dividends), a large and increasing share of the profits from the exploitation of the South African remains in South Africa itself, and is reinvested in new development. Thus, for example, £235 million in profits from South African gold mining have been reinvested in further gold-mining development. As a result, South Africa has advanced and developed industrially at a far greater rate than any other part of Africa. It has developed and built up a considerable manufacturing industry; it has started to develop basic resources such as iron and steel smelting, petroleum production and processing of agricultural products; it has become far and away the most highly advanced industrial economy in Africa. And accordingly, it has developed the most glaring contradiction between the vast wealth of its ruling class on the one hand, and the poverty of its working class — a contradiction which is the more apparent since the two groups live side by side, not separated by the tremendous distances which isolate the wealth of British imperialism, for example, from the poverty of its colonial subjects.

OUTPOSTS OF IMPERIALISM

Thus South Africa, nominally independent, formally self-governing, reveals in the most patent fashion all the real implications of imperialism which are elsewhere concealed or obscured. Its formal independence, however, screens its economic dependence on foreign capital. One half of all British capital

investment in Africa is in South Africa. This capital investment has provided the main impetus for the development of the country's mining industry, which forms the backbone of the whole economy, employing 64.7 thousand whites, 518 thousand Africans, paying almost £130 million annually in wages, purchasing £98 million in South African products annually (including some 27% of all electric power), and extracting a profit (from gold and uranium only) of £165 million per year. Though official statistics reveal that only 24.4% of South African mining shares are held by foreign investors, these shareholdings are not equally distributed over all mining companies, but are concentrated in those 'holding' companies which effectively control and direct the operations of a host of subsidiary companies. British capital investment also dominates the field of banking, through substantial holdings in both the main banking houses, Barclays and Standard, which together own total assets of £1,048 million, including £407 in loans to private persons and companies, chiefly in the field of manufacturing and commerce. Of South Africa's total foreign liabilities, only 13% is invested in state or official funds, 87% in private investments. Of the private sector, £453 million (37%) is in mining, £303 million (25%) in manufacturing, and £196 million (16%) in financial institutions other than commercial banking and insurance. Lord Home, Secretary of State for Commonwealth relations in Britain, claims that of £700 million invested from abroad in South Africa between 1946 and 1955, £500 million came from Britain alone. The balance is mainly American capital, which has recently expanded its investments in South Africa very rapidly, especially through a dramatic take-over of one of the country's main mining-financial groups — Rand Mines Ltd. (9 producing gold mines, a press monopoly Argus Printing and Publishing, investments at a market value of £14½ million) — by a syndicate of American bankers together with the Engelhard Industries Group of the United States.

*AFRIKANER NATIONALISM

Anglo-American capital is the backbone and foundation of the country's ruling class. But it is not the whole of it. Agriculture, industry and state capital make up the remainder. Agriculture, white South African agriculture, is large scale ranching. (The only peasant class of any significance is amongst non-whites). The 1957 agricultural census reveals that there are 103,000 white-owned

*The *Afrikaners* (Boers) form a majority of the 3,000,000 White inhabitants of South Africa. Their language, *Afrikaans*, derived from Dutch. They are not to be confused with the 10,000,000 indigenous *African* people of the country.

farms, with an average area of just less than 1,000 morgen apiece (a morgen = 2.2 acres approx.) at an average value of £14 per morgen. One quarter of the farms occupy three-quarters of the total farm acreage. Apart from the number of African share-croppers and 'labour-tenants' on these farms, there were 834,000 non-white labourers employed, producing a gross value of £359 million in field crops and livestock products (1958). Farming is dominated by the Afrikaans-speaking section of the capitalist class. The form of ownership is mainly individual — that is, not company or corporation controlled — with the majority of proprietors living on their farms. Absentee landlordism is a growing phenomenon, but of fairly recent and post-war origin. It is farming that has been the main preserver of the backward, frontier mentality of white South Africans; isolated, rural life has preserved the extremely conservative, chauvinistic and authoritarian nature of the past period; on the basis of a rigid Calvinistic outlook, and by its total dependence on non-white labour under primitive conditions, it has provided the mainsprings of Afrikaner nationalism, and remains the main bulwark of support for the present Nationalist government.

Afrikaner (that is, Afrikaans-speaking capitalist) farming has inevitably, by its very nature, given rise to Afrikaner capital accumulation, and to an urban capitalist group amongst the Afrikaners. To this group, the doors to the commanding heights of economic power are closed, both by the complete monopolisation of the financial-mining pinnacles by the English-speaking capitalist group, and by the fact that it is a late-comer on the scene, with comparatively slender capital resources. Afrikaner nationalism has been called in to help prise open the doors to economic power which the Afrikaner bourgeoisie cannot penetrate with their capital resources alone. In the beginning, around the 1930's, the use of national chauvinism to promote the interests of the Afrikaner bourgeoisie was a primitive process; paltry subscriptions were collected amongst the nationalist supporters, to promote trading ventures, assurance companies and banking institutions for 'die volk' — (the people). It has moved far from those primitive beginnings; today Afrikaner capitalism is big business, capitalised and capitalising on Afrikaner nationalism. Thus the main Afrikaner banking house demagogically calls itself 'Volkskas' (The People's Chest), the main mining-financial and share-owning group 'Volksbeleggings' (People's Investments), though both are typical capitalist enterprises. Afrikaner private capital's development, though rapid, has not generally been of great significance. The

exceptions are the two companies referred to, SANLAM (life insurance, which bought heavily in gold-mining and industrial shares when stock exchange prices tumbled after Sharpeville last year, to the tune of some £6¼ million) and the Rembrandt Corporation, a South African tobacco manufacturing concern which has developed spectacularly, taking over Rothmans, Carreras and other foreign tobacco corporations, and which now claims to be the world's largest manufacturer of cigarettes and tobaccos. The Nationalist Party has remained a vehicle for the expansion of Afrikaner capitalism. In recent years, almost every Nationalist Party controlled public body and municipality has summarily transferred its banking business to Volkskas, without any explanation of the transfer other than national chauvinism.

AFRIKANER STATE CAPITALISM

In similar fashion, Afrikaner nationalism has been used to promote the growth of a substantial state capitalist sector of industry, under nominally independent corporations, whose whole capital is state subscribed, and whose directorates are overwhelmingly composed of supporters of the Nationalist Party. That this is not what the Afrikaner bourgeoisie desires, but is the best substitute it can at present get for private economic power is underlined by the statement of one of the foremost representatives of Afrikaner capitalism in the state sector, M. S. Louw :

> "I hope that in the future there will be a change in the form of foreign investment. I would like to see a larger proportion of *loan* capital coming from abroad, coupled with active steps to encourage overseas parent companies to decontrol their South African subsidiaries by making their majority shareholdings available to South African investors . . . South Africa is a capitalist country, and there has never been any real desire for State-owned industries".

State-owned industries nevertheless continue to expand under Nationalist Party government direction. ISCOR, assets £135 million, is the country's only iron and steel producer of any consequence, with an output of 75% of the country's annual consumption, the balance being mainly imported. Its subsidiary, VECOR is the country's largest metal manufacturing and engineering concern. SASOL is the country's only producer of oil and petroleum, (from coal) with a maximum present capacity of some 39 million gallons of petroleum and a further 20 million gallons of gas, oils and chemicals annually. ESCOM produces 133,600 units of electricity annually, and monopolies the main-line distribution and supply in bulk of electric power. The growth of state capitalism is facilitated by the Industrial Development

Corporation, a state owned concern, which uses its £46 million capital to finance and assist private local industry. It has £6½ million in shares in private manufacturing concerns, and a similar sum in loans to private industry. The latest South African budget, increases the capital of IDC by a further £10 million. (Mention should be made of the fact that the entire South African railways, harbours and airport system, broadcasting and telephone services are operated as departments of state, in addition to these formally independent corporations referred to).

INDUSTRY

The final sector of the capitalist class in South Africa is that sector engaged in manufacturing, chiefly in secondary industry. Manufacturing is also a comparative late-comer to the scene, but its growth has been remarkable. From 70,000 non-white workers employed in 1930, it has grown to employ over 400,000 today. Its annual wage bill runs to (1956) £256 million by comparison with mining's £97 million. The gross value of its production (1958) was £1,174 million, against agriculture's £359 million. Nevertheless, in the overall picture of the South African capitalist class, its influence and significance is far less than the figures indicate. There are several reasons for this. It has not yet reached the state of cartelisation of mining, being mainly made up of a host of small and competing concerns. It is to some large degree dependent on the financial controls which in South Africa means mainly the Anglo-American mining-finance corporations. A substantial share in manufacturing industry is directly owned and controlled by the mining-finance corporations themselves, and is, in every sense of the word, subsidiary to mining. And finally, a substantial share of the manufacturing industry is directly owned by foreign parent concerns, and thus follows the overall patterns of foreign imperialist interests which are again mining interests. (As, for example, General Motors, Goodyear Tyres, Imperial Chemical Industries, Lever Bros., Cheeseborough-Ponds, Kellogs, etc.).

CLASS UNITY AND CLASS DIVISION

The decisive sectors of South African capitalism, therefore, are — on the one hand, mining-finance capital, substantially of British imperial origin, represented by the English speaking section of the ruling class and the United Party; on the other, agricultural and state capital with a small private sector, represented by the Afrikaans speaking section of the ruling class and the governing Nationalist Party. Between these two sections there is a basic

unity of class interest; both are equally determined to maintain the colonial-type exploitation of non-white labour, and both are therefore equally white-supremacist in outlook and policy. But not every aspect of South African policy goes to the root of the class interests of the capitalist class; there are many aspects of state policy, especially those particularly vicious, chauvinistic and oppressive aspects which have been introduced by the Nationalist government, which are not essential to the interests of the capitalist class as a whole. They are the expression, rather, of the unbridled racial chauvinism and fascist ideology which has overtaken the Afrikaner Nationalist movement. Thus the two sections of the ruling class are deeply divided on the means and methods to be employed in preserving their basic class interests. The Nationalist Party claims that the United Party methods of implementing white supremacy must lead inevitably to racial equality and thus to the final overthrow of white supremacy itself. The United Party, on its side, claims that Nationalist policy will lead to non-white revolution, and thus to the liquidation of both white supremacy and of big capitalist interests.

Every act of world solidarity with the South African people heightens this division; it moves one section of the ruling class to ever greater intransigence, another to more vocal and organised opposition. It undermines the unity of the ruling class. The importance of this division must be judged against the background fact that here is the most powerful economic section and the most heavily armed section of the ruling class anywhere in Africa, as well as the only ruling class on the continent that has any mass support amongst the local population capable — as the South African white minority of almost three million in a total population of 15 million is overwhelmingly capable — of being used as gend-armes of ruling-class counter-revolution against the people.

By way of contrast, every act of international solidarity with South Africa has the effect of reinforcing the confidence of the non-white people, raising their spirit, and heightening their struggle for the overthrow of the Nationalist government and of white supremacy itself. The tremendous and still-developing sweep of the international movement of solidarity with the people of South Africa enables them to face the overwhelmingly strength — military, bureaucratic and political — of their ruling class with a constantly rising confidence that theirs is the winning and the unvanquishable side in this unequal struggle for liberation. It is for these reasons that the political fighters in South Africa have

rejected the "philanthropic" advice of some liberal South Africans to call off trade boycott, which will cause hardship amongst the non-white workers themselves, possible retrenchments and unemployment. Of course it will. No one in his right mind can think otherwise. But nevertheless, the politically articulate opponents of white supremacy have called — and continue to call — for increasing trade, diplomatic and political isolation of South Africa. Struggles for social change are never won easily or without sacrifice, least of all in Nationalist dominated South Africa. This is understood and accepted.

THE TRADE BOYCOTT

The boycott movement hits different sections of the ruling class differently. The trade boycott hits hardest at the predominantly Nationalist white farmers, who are heavily dependent on their export trade — and must remain so as long as low wages in South Africa prevent any considerable expansion in home consumption. Of the country's total exports of £353 million in 1958 (excluding gold), £201 was in the form of consumers goods or agricultural products. The balance was chiefly uranium, copper, diamonds, machines and vehicles. The consumer's goods exported were as follows :

Agricultural products : Wool £42.5m. Fruit £33.1m. Hides £11.2m. Wattle £5.1m. Other £14.6m.

Processed agricultural products : i.e. Food, Drink and Tobacco : £54.4m.

Other consumers goods : £31.1m., being textiles, clothing, oils, waxes, paints, drugs, chemicals, fertilisers, leather and rubber goods etc. in many of which there is a considerable 'agricultural' content.

This is the most vulnerable sector of South Africa's export trade. Just how vulnerable is revealed by the by the following table for the year 1957/58.

Crop	Total Harvest	Exported	per cent. Exported
*Maize (million bags)	40	15.7	39.25
*Millet (million bags)	2	.77	37.25
Sugar (thousand tons)	960	163	17
Tobacco — including manufactures (million lb.)	55.8	43.9	78.66
Citrus (million cases)	9	6.7	74.5
Wool (million lb.)	299.1	299.1	100
Wine & Brandy (million gals.)	37.3	4.6	12.27

*Excluding the production of the so-called "Bantu" areas, none of which is exported.

This large export trade in agricultural products (to which should be added considerable exports of canned sea-foods) is highly sensitive to overseas trade boycotts and sanctions. With the expulsion of South Africa from the Commonwealth and the possible falling away of imperial preferences the position of the White agriculturalists will become even more precarious. The United Kingdom was South Africa's best customer, taking 30 per cent. of all her exports. Despite Verwoerd's assertions to the contrary it is almost certain that this trade will decline. Australian, Canadian and other Commonwealth producers will not be slow to claim their share of South Africa's lucrative trade in Britain.

The combination of mass popular struggles inside South Africa with solidarity actions outside exerts pressure in a different way on the mining-financial group of the ruling class. After the Sharpeville events of a year ago, there was a dramatic flight of foreign capital from South Africa. Monetary reserves fell to their lowest point for many years; £200 million was wiped off the value of shares quoted on the Stock Exchange. The sources of new capital — the life-blood of the mining economy, — dried up, due to the sudden realisation in financial circles, in South Africa and abroad, that the policies of the Nationalist government do not make for the stability of the economy, but threaten to set afoot an endless chain of disturbances, uprisings and revolts.

ATTACK ON FINANCE CAPITAL

But the chief vulnerabiliy of mining-finance to world solidarity actions is in the field of South Africa's imports — finance and labour. Mining is utterly dependent on imported labour. Since the decision was taken by the All-African People's Conference to work for the cutting off of the flow of contracted African labour to the Rand mines, little has yet happened except for Tanganyika's cancellation of the recruiting rights of the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association. Little can reasonably be expected to happen, — at least in cutting off the flow — until the main sources of that labour — Tanganyika and Basutoland — build up their own economies to absorb the workers, and until the other main sources — Rhodesia and Portuguese East Africa achieve their independence. But in another way, there is much that can be done immediately. It *is* possible for the independent African governments to demand trade union rights for their workers; to demand full implementation of the ILO Convention on contract labour; to insist upon and enforce the right of their citizens to have free access to the African Mineworkers Union, and full rights of collective bargaining. Such action, apart from its desirability for the welfare of the citizens of these states who come to South Africa to work, would break the

iron curtain which the mining companies maintain around their compounds, and enable the Union to emerge legally and effectively, from the semi-secret, virtually underground channels in which it is forced to operate at present.

Such action will not bring the edifice of mining capital tumbling down. Nor will consumer boycotts bring the agricultural capitalists to their knees. But they act as a powerful lever against ruling class unity; they cause confusion and doubts amongst the ruling class, and give rise to divisions which make the struggle against their white-supremacist policies easier. That this is in the interests of the people of South Africa is clear. That it is also in the interests of the people of Africa as a whole is equally clear. For the South African ruling class stands as the economic colossus of imperialism in Africa, its main economic and military base, its main centre for intrigue against the governments of independent African states, the main bulwark of colonialism in British Southern African states and in Portuguese colonies. It is the main upholder of colonial reaction everywhere, especially in the Rhodesias; it is the main military threat and economic obstacle to the real independence of Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and South West Africa; it is the source of infection of the whole of Africa with white chauvinism. While it remains so, white South African authority is a threat to the peaceful progress of Africa, and an ever-present threat to the prospects of sustained peace on the continent.

THREAT TO WORLD PEACE

More; by its vicious racial policy which constitutes an intolerable insult to the national self-respect of the majority of the world's peoples; by its repeated and deliberate flouting for the past thirteen years of solemn resolutions of the United Nations, the South African regime constitutes a serious threat to the cause of world peace. And it has more than once been branded as such, including the resolution of the Security Council of March 1960, which called upon the Verwoerd regime to mend its evil ways. Secretary-General Hammarskjöeld was sent to South Africa to see to the implementation of this decision. He made no attempt to meet any of the spokesmen of the voiceless masses of South African people, confining himself to official talks with Verwoerd and his appointees. Nevertheless he will have, in due course, to report back to the Security Council; and his report cannot but indicate that so far from complying with the Council's directive those in power in South Africa are intensifying the very policies and actions which

the 1960 resolution branded as a threat to world peace. The question is : what will the Security Council do next ? Unless it is to commit an even greater fiasco than it brought about in the Congo, and forfeit all confidence of the peace-loving peoples of the world, the Council will have to take effective action against the Nazi Verwoerd régime, up to and including the imposition of economic sanctions.

"*The abolition of colonialism*", says the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties, "*will also be of great importance in easing world tension and consolidating universal peace*". And in achieving this goal no task is more urgent on the African Continent than the overthrow and liquidation of the apartheid regime in South Africa, the vicious expression of Africa's most reactionary and aggressive colonialists. In this, world solidarity with the embattled peoples of South Africa is an important aid and duty of progressive and peace-loving men and women everywhere.

Yet, it is only an aid. In the end, the task of liquidating apartheid must be carried out by the people of the country themselves. No one understands this better than those tireless and courageous fighters for human freedom and dignity, the masses of oppressed and exploited South Africans.

"CONCESSIONS" BY THE IMPERIALISTS

"The working class party must under no circumstances forget . . . a particularly important feature which liberals and opportunists often lose sight of, namely, the part played by "concessions" as *an instrument of deception and corruption*".

—V. I. LENIN, "Selected Works" Vol. 3, p. 483.

Marxist Education Series: No. 2

Aspects of Capitalism

By Jalang Kwena

In our last study — Changes and Development of Human Society — we gave a short account of three distinct social orders : the primitive communal society, slavery, and the feudal mode of production. According to the teachings of Karl Marx, all social changes and development arise from changes in the mode of production, from further development of the productive forces of society. "No social order is destroyed until all the productive forces for which it gives scope have been developed". So the productive forces of the capitalist mode of production came into being within the feudal system.

In this study we are dealing with some aspects of the capitalist mode of production.

SOME DEFINITIONS

We shall begin with brief definitions of some of the terms used in Marxist writings on the capitalist system.

Capital is value which brings in surplus value by exploitation of wage-workers; it is money or goods which bring in profit by exploiting workers. Capital is divided into two parts :

— constant capital : that part which consists of or is spent on means of production — machines, buildings, raw material and fuel.
This part of capital "does not create new value and does not change its magnitude".

— variable capital : that part which is spent on buying labour power, or the workers' power to work. "This part of capital grows as a result of the creation by the workers of surplus value". The surplus is taken by the capitalist.

A *Commodity* is something which (a) has a use-value, i.e. satisfies some human demand, and (b) is produced not for personal use but for exchange or sale. Not everything that satisfies some human demand is necessarily a commodity; to be a commodity it must be a product or creation of labour.

Kinds of Value. There are three kinds of value :

— *use-value* is the quality which makes a thing satisfy some human demand, such as food, clothing, shelter, an object of beauty, etc.

— *exchange-value,* often simply called *value,* is a measurement expressing the quantitative relationship between the use-value of one kind of commodity as against that of another. Thus the exchange value of a pair of shoes may be equal to that of three sacks of mealies. Value is expressed approximately in market prices. Value or exchange value is determined by the socially necessary labour time expended in producing each commodity.

— *surplus value* is the value created by the labour of the worker in excess of the value of his labour power. It is appropriated by the capitalists without compensation.

— *labour-power* "is man's ability to work, the sum total of the physical and spiritual forces of man, thanks to which he is able to produce material wealth". It is the creator of value. Labour-power is itself a commodity and its value is determined by the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the education and maintenance of the worker and his family.

— *Profit* "is surplus value compared with the total capital invested in production and appearing outwardly to be engendered by the capital".

WHAT IS CAPITALISM ?

The capitalist mode of production, or capitalism, is a social system based on private property in the means of production, the production of commodities, and the exploitation of the class of wage-workers — the proletariat — by the capitalist class — the bourgeoisie. It is essentially a system of competition and anarchy in production. It is true that there was commodity production and exploitation under the slave-owning mode of production and under feudalism. But under capitalism commodity production and the exploitation of labour have become the main activity and objective.

At first capitalism subjected production to itself just as it found it. The feudal economy was based on the products of the peasants, handicraftsmen and journeymen. During the period of transition in sixteenth to eighteenth century Europe, the capitalists did not change the existing forces of production. They merely

organised and employed those old productive forces in new large workshops where work was done together under conditions of specialisation. Here workers co-operated in producing a given article, each doing a specific part. In other spheres of the new economy, team work was introduced. Thus arose large undertakings such as coach-makers, harness makers, coppersmiths and so on.

The new methods of work proved efficient, more productive and cheaper. They enable the capitalist owners of the first workshops to produce commodities cheaply and to compete successfully against the smaller producers. This transitional stage from petty commodity producers to large-scale undertakings was important for the training and preparation of skilled personnel for the future large-scale machine industry.

In Europe the development of capitalist commodity production practically wiped out all that remained of the old self-sufficing family economy and led to disintegration of the peasantry and petty producers, a small number of whom passed into the ranks of the bourgeoisie while the bulk entered the ranks of the proletariat. Now there were more mouths to feed and bodies to clothe. These new conditions — the victory of the bourgeois revolution, the abolition of serfdom and the ending of feudal disunity, the forcible dispossession of the peasantry, the accumulation of capital, the extension of trade and the vastly increased demand for the means of subsistence — opened up the road for the full development of the capitalist economy. New inventions were in urgent demand, and the large-scale introduction of machinery in factories and workshops. The steam engine, the loom, and machines to produce machines were invented, and improvements made in the methods of smelting metal. The era of capitalist industrialisation had begun in most important countries of Europe and North America.

MONEY

Money is a universal equivalent — a commodity which can easily be exchanged in terms of all other commodities. It played an important part in the development of commodity exchange and trade. Before a universal equivalent was established, the process of exchange was a laborious and cumbersome affair of barter, requiring the producer of a commodity to cart his wares about in search of the goods he wanted. Apart from this difficulty it was not easy to accumulate wealth except in the form of livestock or mixed property. With the development of metal, the separation of

handicrafts from agriculture and the widening of the market, the money form of value appeared.

In a commodity economy money is a tremendous force, giving power over men. Everything can be bought for money. It comes to seem that this capacity to buy anything and everything is a natural property of gold, whereas in reality "it is a result of definite social relations".

As universal equivalents gold and silver, apart from their great value, have the advantages of size, weight and long life, and can be easily divided. In addition, money in the form of coins, bars or articles made of gold and silver can be accumulated or hoarded.

Money functions as the measure of value, the means of accumulation, the means of payment and world-wide currency. On the world market money appears in the form of bars of precious metals. As a world-wide currency in circulation between different countries, gold is the universal purchasing and paying medium. It pays for imports and the settlement of international debts, as well as interest on foreign loans and investments. Gold is "the universal embodiment of social wealth when this is transferred from one country to another in monetary form".

Money and commodity exchange existed before capitalism. But with the coming of fully-fledged capitalism money became the highest aim of the bourgeois society. Previously men had sought to get money in order to buy the commodities they needed. Now they produced commodities in order to get money.

THE DRIVE FOR PROFITS

Those capitalists who were quick to introduce machinery and employ higher techniques produced their commodities at reduced costs, but sold them at prices which corresponded to the socially necessary labour time. In this way they received higher profits and became richer than those who were slow to introduce the new methods. This impelled the remaining commodity producers also to make technical improvements in their own enterprises. As a result of the actions of these separate commodity producers, each striving for his separate advantage, progress was rapidly made in techniques and the productive forces were developed.

Soon more commodities were produced than the home market could consume. This led to production among the capitalist countries for foreign markets and spheres of influence and the conquest of foreign territories. The struggle for political control

and economic domination of foreign territories often led to wars among the competing capitalist nations, and between threatened nations or peoples and the foreign intruders. "Foreign trade arises from an international division of labour. Under capitalism it serves as one of the methods of economic enslavement of industrially less developed countries by more developed capitalist powers".

DEFECTS OF CAPITALISM

Capitalism is an essentially planless and individualistic society. The producers work blindly for an unknown market. "Only the spontaneous fluctuations of prices on the market inform the commodity producers whether they have produced goods in excess of the effective demand by the population or have not produced sufficient to meet it".

Capitalism periodically runs into serious political and economic difficulties arising from the contradiction between the social character of its production and the private appropriation of the products of labour by the capitalist. The capitalists are ever trying to increase the rate of exploitation of the working class, which the workers naturally resist as this means lower wages and worse conditions of work. There is anarchy in production and stiff competition between capitalists, each seeking to ruin the other.

Thus capitalism suffers from periodic dislocation of the economy and crises of overproduction and depressions, accompanied by mass unemployment and great suffering among the working population. Small producers are ruined, plant stands idle, and the means of production are concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. Bitter and grim industrial and political struggles take place continuously between the forces of the ruling class and the workers.

The capitalists continually seek, in various ways, to intensify the exploitation of the workers and the mass of the population — the lengthening of the working day or increasing the intensity of labour; piece work; depression of wages in different ways, including the inflation of currency; direct and indirect taxation; higher prices and rents; use of child and convict labour; purchase taxes and service levies; high transport charges and school and hospital fees.

The workers naturally fight back, striving through organisation and unity in trade unions and workers' political parties to gain higher wages and better conditions of work; lower taxes; better and cheaper housing, transport, education and social amenities. Ultimately, the goal of the workers' movements become the conquest of state power and the establishment of socialism in which

the source of the capitalists' domination — their private ownership of the means of production — will be ended.

In our times, about which we shall learn more in our succeeding studies, the price of the continuation of capitalism in its final, degenerate stages, has become ghastly international wars which claim their victims in millions.

THE BALANCE SHEET

Capitalism is a system of contradictions and contrasts. There is no doubt that until the advent of socialism capitalism was — from the point of view of material wealth, cultural and social development — the most advanced of all societies and civilisations that man had built. The capitalist mode of production superseded that of feudal society as a higher and more progressive social order, corresponding to the stage of development of the then existing productive forces of society.

Compared with the stagnant and stultifying feudal order, capitalism was a progressive and dynamic force. Though objectively serving their own selfish interests, the ideas and demands of the bourgeois politicians and philosophers for democracy, liberty, equality and fraternity were a boon to mankind. Upon such principles were based such fundamental human rights as freedom of speech, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, freedom of association and freedom of worship, which served as a strong and very important social and moral force, which greatly helped to liberalise and advance social, political and legal institutions.

Yet it can never be forgotten that capitalism came into the world, as Marx has said, "dripping with blood from head to foot". It was stained from birth with innumerable crimes, naked robbery, cruel exploitation of men, women and children, merciless colonial conquest. Capitalism has led to the most devastating wars in human history; to the conquest and colonisation of Africa, Asia and South America, robbed them of immense material and human resources, and deliberately retarded their economic, political and cultural progress. In these acts of plunder Africa alone lost over 100 million of her sons and daughters sold in slavery, and millions more killed in the robbers' predatory wars, or in mines and plantations extracting and gathering riches for foreign exploiters. Her valuable diamonds, gold, copper, rubber and other raw materials and

foodstuffs have been exported to Europe and America, while her people lived in poverty and died of hunger and diseases caused by starvation.

As long as there were still some unconquered regions in Africa, Asia and South America to be explored and captured, capitalism expanded and the policy of free international competition flourished. But when there were no more "free areas" to be taken, savage conflicts broke out between the capitalists and between capitalist nations. The era of free economic competition and prosperity came to an end. This position was reached towards the close of the nineteenth century, with the advent of the last stage of capitalism — imperialism. We shall deal with this stage in the next issue of the *African Communist*.

A Marxist Book on Africa

Review of AFRICA—THE ROOTS OF REVOLT

By Jack Woddis

(*Published by Lawrence and Wishart, London,* 1960)

Books on Africa and African problems are pouring off the printing presses of the capitalist countries, for writers and publishers, like investors and the financial houses, have re-discovered the African continent.

Some of the books are ambitious, omnibus tomes which try to present between two covers the facts of all the countries of the Continent; works whose very weight and range of information obscure the basic political and economic trends pulsing beneath African society. Other books are painstaking post-mortems of one country or one problem : constitutional manipulation in British colonies; studies of village life, farming practices, of religious attitudes, of transportation patterns; of new political movements and African claims as interpreted by the outsider. The explorer and historian, the geographer, the colonial administrator, the scholar, the specialist and university researcher, the journalist flying to the capital of the newly emergent African state or the heart of the newest revolt against the colonial system, all these are having a field day.

Many of the books on Africa are overtaken by events even as they appear in print. For Africa is a continent swept by revolution and hardly any point is untouched by change. It is not enough in writing about a continent in revolution to describe and interpret the old society already changing out of all recognition, or even the crisis of the day. Above all, writers on Africa must point the direction of change, must analyse the forces at work in Africa which make for change, for only in this way can future events be anticipated and understood.

This does not mean that none of the books on Africa recognise the gale force of the changes coming over the continent. Many of them do, and are written to try to get America and Britain, France and Belgium, the colonial forces in Africa, to adapt to changing circumstances so that the levers of power remaining in imperialist hands may be used with greater flexibility so as to retain their grip.

But long overdue has been a book on Africa which will serve

not the colonial administrator, but the African revolution itself, a book written by the working class fighter, the trade union organiser, the Marxist analyist who sees Africa from the viewpoint of the struggling African peoples, and who writes to help chart their revolutionary course of the future.

Such a book is 'Africa — the Roots of Revolt' by Jack Woddis.

Woddis quotes Abdoulaye Diallo, secretary-general of the All African People's Conference and Guinea's Resident Minister at Accra as saying that the African people no longer regard their working and living conditions as the key question in Africa. "What is important", Diallo said "is not our conditions but what we are doing to change them".

The forces for change are the main content of the Woddis book, but it is impossible to trace these, or to write about the African revolt without describing what Africans are trying to free themselves from, for it is sixty and more years of imperialist oppression that has caused today's upsurges, so this first book — for Woddis has a second now coming off the presses — examines the roots of revolt and characterises the special nature of the exploitation that enslaved Africa.

THE BIG THREE

The history of Africa's relations with the West has been a history of robbery — robbery of African manpower, mineral and agricultural resources, and its land. These three giants : labour, land and resources, remain the three dynamic issues over which the struggle for the future of Africa is being fought, and though conditions in the settler-dominated countries of Central, East and Southern Africa and the almost exclusively African states of West Africa differ vastly in detail, the control of these three sources of wealth is the common denominator to all African problems.

The first four chapters quote from a wealth of writing and research to show the process of land theft, tax imposition and forced labour.

Land grabbing by imperialist powers started during the scramble for Africa at the end of the nineteenth century, but continues even today. Woddis shows that while the basic reason for land robbery was the simple one of primitive accumulation — to take land because of the minerals underground or the crops that could be grown upon it — this was not the whole answer, for in

the countries most pillaged by occupying colonial forces, only a small portion of the land set aside for them is in use. Land has been taken from the Africans for other reasons : to prevent the African peasant from becoming a competitor to the White farmer or plantation owner; but above all to impoverish the African peasant and so to compel him to enter the colonial labour market, in mine, farm or industry.

Similarly the *poll tax system* has never been looked upon mainly as a source of revenue, as is usually the case with taxation systems, but as a means of forcing the African into a money economy. Significantly the taxation of Africans on a capitation basis was introduced at the dawn of the imperialist epoch, the beginning of the twentieth century, when the export of European capital to Africa was stepped up and the exploitation of African labour became an important factor in the profit-making activities of the big European companies.

Traditional African agriculture and the subsistence economy were destroyed by this two-pronged attack : the seizure of tribal lands and the levying of heavy taxes which drew subsistence farmers into an elaborate system of exchange economy, and forced them to offer their labour for cash wages.

In a later chapter on the level of African wages, Woddis draws a useful contrast between early America and Africa where opposite sets of conditions fixed wage standards. In America there was an abundance of free land available, so wage labourers could convert themselves into independent self-sustaining peasants and the market for labour favoured the workers. In Africa it was a case of farmers being forced to become workers and employers being free to offer as low wages as they decided.

The whole *labour* system in Africa is based thus on thinly disguised forms of compulsion, and the kingpin is the migrant labour system, which is basic to the forms of colonial exploitation in Africa. The villages of Nyasaland are threatened with the collapse of their entire economic structure by the absence of as high as 70 per cent. of their adult men. Two-thirds of the miners on the Witwatersrand come from outside South Africa. Nearly the half of the Southern Rhodesian labour force is immigrant labour. A majority of the Uganda labour force is migrant; about half the unskilled labourers in Ghana are drawn from other territories; over half the able-bodied men of Basutoland leave the territory every year; and as staggering a number as 75 per cent. of the adult men

of southern Mozambique work away from home for protracted periods.

THE WORKER-PEASANT

Labour migration is not a phenomenon restricted to Africa, yet in Africa it has distinctive features. It is a migration almost overwhelmingly of adult males; the migration is repeated time and again in the life of the individual peasant-worker; it leads to a total disharmony of the economy of the African countryside; makes the acquisition of labour skill difficult for the African worker, creates difficulties in the way of trade union organisation, and keeps wages depressed.

Migrant labour, Woddis points out, is at the heart of the continent's labour system for it is the mechanism by which imperialism maintains a steady supply of cheap labour. In the long run migrant labour is cheaper than permanent labour. A permanent labour force would require a rising scale of wages, and also social amenities such as housing, provision for old age and unemployment. There are also political reasons for keeping the migrant labour system going : this is one way the imperialists try to retard the formation of a permanent working class, capable of maturing into a powerful proletariat, for the ruling classes know well that it is from the organised workers of the towns that the sharpest challenges to imperialist exploitation come.

Yet labour migration has a two-pronged effect and though the curse of Africa, it becomes the basis for an alliance between the workers and the peasants, an essential foundation for a powerful national liberation movement. For while the system of migrant labour prevents the emergence of an established modern proletariat, yet it has resulted in the majority of African men in large parts of Africa experiencing wage labour for part of their lives. Working class experiences and lessons are carried back into the remote countryside village and the worker-peasant gains invaluable experience of working class methods of struggle.

Woddis makes the point that the migrant labour system has to some extent concealed the widespread agrarian crisis in the African countryside, for the reason that the African peasantry has not taken part in the national liberatory movement as a separate conscious and organised political force. He sees no large-scale sustained peasant revolts like those that took part in Asia, and comments that the African peasant has in the main done his fighting against imperialism in the towns as a migrant worker.

This might well have been the position until recent years, but the picture has been changing of late (think of Pondoland and general revolt in the Transkei in South Africa; the Kikuyu rebellion in Kenya).

The vicious spiral of land shortage, heavy taxation, forced labour migration, and depressed wages calculated on the specious foundation that the migrant has some means of support in his rural home, impress on the African the fact that migrant labour can only be broken up by the break up of the colonial system itself.

Every wage demand of the African worker, Woddis points out, becomes the occasion not only of an intense class struggle between the workers and their employers; but is transformed into an anti-imperialist struggle, for the worker sees the armed forces, the legal apparatus, the resources of an entire colonial government being brought in to play to resist workers' demands and maintain the colonial cheap labour system.

Thus it is the very conditions under which he lives that are the most rapid educator of the African, for the politics of national independence are driven into his head by his everyday experiences. Soon enough he learns that no fundamental change in his life, no social or economic advance, is possible without political change, and that the essence of this political change must be the destruction of the colonial system.

> Woddis writes : "The experience of the African working class, the growth of their understanding and of their organisations, and the great struggles they have waged have, in a very real sense, been the forerunners of the present national movements which are sweeping the cotinent. It is above all the workers, who by their great strikes and demonstrations, have revealed to all Africans the system of imperialist exploitation under which they live . . . and have shaken up the whole imperialist edifice by their repeated blows against their oppressors . . ."

Yet a detailed examination of the size, composition and character of the working class and Africa shows that it bears all the hall-marks of a working class in a colonial economy, and has barely developed as a class over large areas of Africa.

It is in the white settler areas where the proportion of Africans engaged in wage labour is greatest and in West Africa, characterised mainly by African farming of cash crops for export, where it is lowest.

Reliable figures are difficult to calculate, but Woddis considers that only between six and seven per cent. of the total African population south of the Sahara (this excludes Egypt and North

African countries of Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco), somewhere between 10 and 12 million people, are engaged in wage labour.

South Africa is the one area of the continent where basic industry has made some headway; in the rest of Africa fewer than 450,000 workers are employed in manufacture (and of this figure 167,312 are in the Congo). The largest proportion of African workers is engaged in domestic and related services; and the second largest consumer of African labour is the extractive industries, of which mining is the most important. In 10 selected territories agriculture and forestry account for 32 per cent. of the total labour force, and mines for 11 per cent. Among the individual territories agriculture accounts for 53 per cent. of the total number of workers in Tanganyika, 48 per cent. in Kenya, and 39 per cent. in Southern Rhodesia. Secondary industry (limited mainly to light industry) provides employment for about 10 per cent. of the total number of wage earners in the 10 territories. An iron and steel industry is devolping in Que Que in Southern Rhodesia but apart from this and the Union of South Africa, scarcely any heavy-engineering exists. Statistics strikingly confirm, therefore, that the characteristics of the African working class are those of a colonial working class, working within the sphere of a colonial economy and scarcely touched by industrialisation. It is a working class mainly unskilled, largely migrant and only partly urbanised.

Yet though in most parts of Africa the working class is still embryonic, it is its rate of growth that is important, the rate at which trade union and working class organisation is growing, and the role of their workers and their relationship with other forces within the national front.

A close and penetrating analysis of the class structure of African society is vital as a guide to the tactics of the struggle for African liberation, and the stages of development after the achievement of independence. By comparison with other continents the working class of Africa is small and weak. But what of the other forces making up the national front, what of the emergent capitalist class, the role of the peasantry, and how do their aims bear on the direction of the struggle and the relative strength and influences of those forces bent on fundamental changes in Africa ?

The material in this book on the workers of Africa is probably more complete than that published anywhere else; but the sections detailing the nature of the emergent African bourgeoisie and the condition of the peasantry are rather fragmentary, probably

because African political movements have themselves badly neglected this field of study.

Imperialism has created in Africa a depressed and land-starved peasantry, an exploited working class based partly in the towns and partly in the countryside, a thwarted small merchant, middle and capitalist class, and a frustrated and rebellious group of students, professionals and intellectuals. Into Africa's national revolution have been drawn whole peoples united in their opposition to imperialism which denies them all possibilities of development. The different sections making up the national liberation front may have divergent class interests, but they are united in opposition to their common enemy.

This unity, this inter-class co-operation, is the key to the victory of the national revolution against imperialism.

But the basis for unity in the national front does not necessarily disappear with the formal declaration of independence, for the struggle then opens to defend the gains of the national revolution, to entrench it and carry it further. Overnight a country achieving national independence does not pass from being a colony to a free country, for it was not only the political control of the imperialists which had to be seized, but also their economic grip which must be loosened, the lopsided economy righted, the old legacies of backwardness caused by the colonial system erased.

In these tasks there is still a strong identity of interest between the groups making up the national front; but the respective strength and dominance of the working class and peasantry or the emergent bourgeoisie will depend to a considerable extent on the detailed class structure within the individual country.

The truth holds that in general the national capitalist, the landowning class and aspirant bourgeoisie, will after liberation turn its attention inward to the drive to exploit its own working class, and will try to backslide in the national struggle and make peace with imperialism once this class has won a modicum of independence.

But such a new alignment of forces within the national front does not crystallise overnight and the role of organised workers and their allies the peasants within the national front is crucial here.

Though Africa's working class is small, so is Africa's capitalist class, for imperialism has stood in the way of its development. On

the whole, too, ruling class efforts to find allies and supporters among the African middle class or better off farmers have been tried too late. Nowhere in Africa as in India, Indonesia and other countries of Asia has any substantial section of the national capitalist class aligned itself with imperialism.

Though the working class is small, the absence of a powerful capitalist class means fewer entrenched interests to resist radical social and economic changes within the society. The absence of a powerful capitalist class should make progress from the national revolution to a socialist revolution far easier than, say, in India, for though the working class is smaller its opposing forces are correspondingly weaker.

There is a further important set of factors which make Africa different from the Asian and Latin American pattern. This is the situation and role of the peasants of Africa.

The Marxist interpretation of the role of the peasantry in the drive to reconstruct the national economy and build socialism has always been affected by the knowledge that for the greater part the peasant fights for his right to own land individually, to till his own narrow strip, and has to be roused to the broader aims of the revolution. In many countries, without dynamic and revolutionary leadership the peasant's ambition for personal ownership of the land has turned him into a conservative force once the first stage of the national revolution has been completed. Not only does a conservative peasantry become a force against the socialisation of the land and other means of production, but the existence of a wealthy peasantry in the countryside, opposed to land and agricultural reform, creates sharp conflict and new barriers to advance.

In Africa special features in the African countryside make the revolutionary potential of the African peasant far greater than in other colonial countries. From Woddis' treatment of migrant labour it is evident that throughout African society this organisation of labour turns peasants into wage earners for a great part of their lives, and strong bonds are riveted between the people of town and countryside. The striker and trade union member in the town goes home after a spell of work and carries new revolutionary objectives into the traditionally conservative countryside.

Woddis also shows that though by the end of the nineteenth century classes were in formation in parts of Africa and forms of feudal land ownership were coming into being, over most of the

continent land is still held in common by the tribe. Membership of the community, not payment of price, is the condition of land holding. Imperialism has disturbed the pattern of land holdings in many parts of the country, but the customary forms of land tenure continue in great areas to this day. This attitude to the communal holding and working of the land means that resistance to socialisation will be largely non-existent or easily overcome. Secondly, the existence of pre-feudal land relations in great parts of Africa means that the rich farmer, the 'kulak', the powerful group of entrenched land owners is generally absent, and the class struggle in the countryside will be relatively peaceful. Thirdly, in large areas of east and southern Africa many of those working on the land are not individual cultivators, but plantation workers, sub-tenants, squatters and sharecroppers. The Cuban revolution received its greatest impetus and mass following in the countryside where only a fraction of the rural population held title deeds to the land they tilled, and the majority were seasonal labourers on sugar, tobacco and coffee plantations. The Cuban countryside had no stratum of owners and tenants, but agricultural labourers alienated from their means of production and having nothing to sell but their labour power. In the Cuban countryside there was relatively close cohesion among the rural population and the absence of a class of wealthy peasants.

Cuba was not like Asia, and Africa is not Cuba; but the diversity of conditions in one society as contrasted with others calls for careful analysis of the facts and dynamics of the special African situation.

How many landless are there ? What are the sizes of land holdings in any specific portion of the African countryside ? Are the peasants largely self-employed or is a class of peasant owners and exploiters growing up ? What proportion of the African peasantry works on plantations and for White farmers and has no claim to its own land at all ? These and other questions must be studied for a proper understanding of the forces for change in the African countryside, and the nature of the alliance which the oppressed peasantry of any country will bring to the advanced working class.

The book by Woddis does not suggest the answers, but then nor does any other work and this gap must be filled by African political students themselves.

Working class leadership of the national front in Africa will spring not from pure theory about the dominant role of the workers, but from the actions of the working class in the liberation struggle, its close alliance and leadership of the oppressed masses of the countryside, and its skill in guarding the interests of the working people and yet avoiding sectarian policies which could smash the national front in the crucial period after the formal achievement of independence.

WHO FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM ?

"By your actions however you, Messieurs the colonialists, are helping the colonial nations to tear away the veil with which you cover the eyes of the peoples, with which you dim their consciences by spreading all kinds of fabrications about the Communists. All the people will realise — and very soon for that matter — that the Communists, the Communist Parties, are the parties that really express the will of the peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence".

— N. S. KHRUSHCHOV, Speech at U.N. General Assembly, September 23, 1960.

(Quoted from the collection "Disarmament and Colonial Freedom" published by Lawrence & Wishart, 81 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2., England. Price 5s.)

Two Messages

A Message to Britain

Text of greetings to the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain from the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party.

To the General Secretary, Communist Party of Great Britain.

Dear Comrade,

We send our warmest brotherly greetings to all delegates to your Congress and to all your members.

We have followed with deep interest the splendid campaigns of the C.P.G.B. against imperialism and war, and in the interests of the British working class. And with especial appreciation we have noted the part you have played in defence of the liberation movements of Africa, and your vanguard role in the great popular movement against apartheid and for the boycott of South African goods.

It is this movement which has largely helped to create the conditions for the great victory of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, which decided to exclude the new South African Republic after May 31 in protest against the racial policies and practices of the Verwoerd Government.

This victory has tremendously heartened and inspired the masses of oppressed and democratic people of our country in their demand for a new National Convention (Constituent Assembly) representative of all our fifteen million people without distinction of race or colour, with soverign powers to frame a constitution for a fully democratic South Africa along the lines of the famous Freedom Charter.

Despite all the difficulties of working under conditions of fascist repression, we South African Communists are determined to play a vigorous and loyal part in this great united front movement; as well as to redouble our efforts to spread the living truths of Marxism-Leninism in our country and our Continent. In these tasks we are tremendously assisted by the brilliant restatement of fundamental Marxist theses in the world we live in today contained in the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties drawn up in Moscow in November, 1960.

We wish you, comrades, a successful and fruitful Congress. And, again, we wish to emphasise the sincere friendship which all of us feel towards your Party which, despite its small size and great difficulties under which it works, has set an outstanding example of fraternal internationalism towards African and other colonial peoples.

Yours fraternally,

JALANG KWENA,

for the Central Committee, South African Communist Party.

March 24, 1961.

A Message to Africa

From **John Gollan**, *General Secretary Communist Party of Great Britain.*

Africa is certainly in the news. It hits the headlines in the press and radio the whole world over. The rapid advance of the liberation struggle is making a big political impact, especially in Britain. It serves to bring out more clearly than ever before that imperialism is the common enemy of both the African and British peoples.

At a time when grave issues are at stake in the Congo, the British territories of Central Africa, and in the Union of South Africa, it is not possible to emphasise this too strongly

British Communists are proud to have taken part in this common struggle, especially so during the past decade. Before Ghana independence they were in the forefront of the struggle against British repression in Nigeria and the Gold Coast. From the first day of the Kenya "emergency" in October 1952 they led the protest campaign against the British imperialist policy of ruthless armed aggression.

When the 1951 Labour Government first proposed Federation in Central Africa the British Communists were the only organised political force in opposition; and from the time it was actually imposed upon the Africans by the Tories in 1953 they have never ceased to expose this form of white minority rule.

Before and after the 1950 Anti-Communist Act in the Union of South Africa the British Communists emphasised that this attack (like Hitler's attack in 1933) was only the first step in the further ruthless suppression of the African majority.

Since those days great strides have been made in the African struggle for liberation. Ghana, Nigeria, and Somalia have won their political independence, and so have the majority of the former French colonies. Sierra Leone achieves its political independence in April, and Tanganyika not long after. Kenya now has an elected African majority, and this will be achieved soon in Uganda and Nyasaland.

Since the first All-African Peoples' Conference in December 1958 the foundation has been laid for a united African advance towards liberation. The third All-African Conference in March this year will no doubt mark a new milestone towards this objective.

The achievement of political independence by 28 African States is a big step forward, but not the end of the struggle. Many of them are only independent in name. The imperialists are fighting back more desperately to regain their political domination and to tighten their economic grip.

Algeria is still waging an armed struggle for its liberation. Real independence for the Congo is now in the balance. In the British territories of Central Africa bitter struggles are still to come. Bigger battles against apartheid in South Africa are now in prospect. And it is in this situation that U.S. imperialism is striving to extend its foothold throughout Africa.

We British Communists will not rest on our oars. We will strive to extend the boycott of South African goods and stimulate greater opposition against the vile system of apartheid. We stand with the African peoples of Central Africa to end the hated Federation and to win freedom and independence in the three territories. We will strive to drive the Belgian invaders out of Congo, so that the Africans can achieve real independence. And we extend full support to the Algerian struggle for liberation.

This is not only our revolutionary duty and responsibility. It is essential to achieve victory in our common struggle to end colonialism and to advance the cause of African freedom. In sending our greetings to the African liberation movements we also give this pledge — never to rest in our duty to struggle to the end against imperialism.

Copies of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST will be sent to any part of Africa for one shilling and six pence (British Postal Order) each, or ten shillings a dozen. The subscription rate is six shillings a year (four issues) or fifteen shillings by airmail. Send British Postal Order to our London agent : —

Mr. Ellis Bowles,
52 Palmerston Road,
East Sheen,
London, S.W.14.

Articles are invited for publication, as well as correspondence on all themes of African interest.
As our Party is illegal, all correspondence must be sent to our London Agent, whose address appears above.

X-Press Print (T.U.), 5 Felixstowe Road, London, N.W.10.